ried to Miss Elizabeth W. Barnes, of Philadelphia, whose parents were of Penn's Manor, Pennsylvania, at which place her grandfather was born. The Barnes family was one of the old families of Pennsylvania, and Mrs. Platt's great-grandfather married a sister of General Jacob Brown, of the United States Army, who fought the battle of Lundy's Lane, and gained great renown in the War of 1812. The children of Mr. and Mrs. Platt are Grace, Philip C., Charles R., Henry S., Jr., James L., Edward B. and Richard B. Platt.

Ploeser, Christian, was born in Seheim, Hesse-Darmstadt, Germany, January 26, 1826, and died in St. Louis, Missouri, April 29, 1895. After receiving a thorough, practical common school education in his native town, young Ploeser served a term of years as an apprentice to the carpenter's and builder's trade, and in 1846 emigrated to the United States, and located in St. Louis. He soon thereafter engaged in business on his own account, and, under the name of Christian Ploeser, manufacturer of saddle trees, located at the corner of Columbus and Soulard Streets, which business he conducted successfully for thirty-four years. In 1880 Mr. Ploeser retired from active business pursuits, and, until his death, devoted himself to looking after his financial interests. On the outbreak of the Civil War, Mr. Ploeser entered the military service as first lieutenant of a company of the United States Reserve Corps of Missouri, and was later promoted to captain, lieutenant-colonel and colonel for meritorious services. Colonel Ploeser was known as a brilliant soldier and efficient commander, and after the war was one of the original members, and first commander of Hassendenbel Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Missouri. He was a strong Republican in politics, and independent in his religious views, an Odd Fellow and a member of the Germania Singing Society. Colonel Ploeser was one of St. Louis' most public-spirited citizens, and contributed liberally of his means in aid of educational, religious and charitable objects, and was thoroughly identified with every undertaking calculated to promote the public welfare. He was not only a thoroughgoing business man, but an upright, honest citizen, who commanded the confidence and respect of his fellow-citizens. He was an acknowledged leader in the circles in which he moved for more than a third of a century, and his demise was the cause of deep grief to a large number of friends and acquaintances. He married Miss Elizabeth Luft, of St. Louis, May 6, 1849. Mrs. Ploeser and seven children survive, Louis Ploeser; Ida, wife of J. V. Feldmann; Eliza Ploeser; Emma, wife of Frank J. Feldmann; Bertha Ploeser; Christian D. Ploeser, and Emily, wife of Dr. Otto Fischer.

Police Department.—The police department of St. Louis is the product of nearly a hundred years' growth from a small beginning—the starting point being a patrol of four persons in 1808. These were taken from all male inhabitants over eighteen years of age. They received no pay, served four months, and were subject to a fine of $1.00 for refusing to serve. In 1818 the force was increased to six men, one of whom was captain. In 1826 all free white males—clergymen, invalids and paupers excepted—were enrolled and required when called upon to take their turn on duty. There was a captain and twenty-six lieutenants appointed by the mayor. In 1839 there was a body called the city guards, composed of sixteen men appointed by the mayor, with a night watch or patrol, the city marshal being ex officio captain of the force, with two lieutenants, at $600 each a year. The guards consisted of sixteen men, at $500 a year. They were required to carry a rattle and a stout hickory staff four feet long, with a crook at one end and a steel point at the other, and in their rounds at night to proclaim the hours. In 1841 the city guards consisted of a captain, three lieutenants and twenty-eight men, the captain of the guards being also captain of the night watch, at a salary of $800, the salary of the lieutenants being $500 each, and of the privates $480. In 1846 there was a reorganization, and the police was made a special department, embracing the city marshal, city guards, day police and keeper of the calaboose, the city guards being composed of one captain, six lieutenants and forty-two privates, and the day police of one lieutenant and seven privates. In the same year there was organized the independent police for doing extra work of a detective character. It was under the control of James McDonough and Mr. Du Breuil. McDonough afterward became chief of police under the metropolitan system. In 1850 the city guard was made to consist of one lieutenant and nine privates, and the night

force of one captain, three lieutenants and thirty-six privates, the city marshal to be chief. A vehicle was provided for carrying prisoners to the calaboose—the first "Black Maria" in St. Louis. In 1852 the police department consisted of sixty-three officers and men in the night guard, and one captain and fifteen men on the day force—the annual cost being $30,000. Down to the year 1861 the police department was entirely under the control of the mayor and city council, but in that year the metropolitan police was established by the Legislature in imitation of the system that had been introduced in New York City a few years before—and it is the system that has prevailed ever since. Although intended mainly for the city of St. Louis, it is in some of its features a State institution, since it is controlled by a board of police commissioners, three of whom are appointed by the Governor of the State, the mayor of the city being ex officio a member of the board, but having no greater authority than any other member. The policemen are not subject to the orders of the mayor, nor is the police department subject to the authority of the municipal assembly—though, as it is intended mainly for the protection of the city, it is supported entirely by the city. The board of police commissioners make all appointments on the force, both officers and privates, and the whole force is subject to their order. The commissioners receive $1,000 a year, the treasurer, who is one of the number, $500 in addition. The first members of the board were John A. Brownlee, James H. Carlisle, Basil W. Duke and Mayor Daniel G. Taylor. James McDonough was made first chief. He held the position for six months in 1861, and was afterward twice re-appointed, holding the position from September, 1870, to March, 1874, and from November, 1875, to June, 1881, his connection with the St. Louis police force covering a period of thirty-eight years. At first there was a chief, with three captains, three lieutenants, twelve sergeants, four turnkeys, five detectives and one hundred and seventy-five privates. The cost in 1861 was $104,000. The force increased with the city's growth, and in 1867, it had 266 officers and privates. In 1868 a mounted force of twenty men was added and a mounted police has been maintained ever since. The cost of the department in 1868 was $300,000, three-fourths paid by the city and one-fourth by the county. In 1873 there were 369 men in the force, and the cost was $439,112. In 1875 there were 462 men, and the cost was $504,063. In 1882 the force consisted of one chief, six captains, forty-five sergeants, ten detectives and 401 patrolmen, the total amount for salaries being $468,220, and the total cost of the department $535,388. The whole cost for the year ending April, 1898, was $950,395. In 1899 the Legislature passed a bill increasing the force and increasing the pay of officers and the men also. Under this act the police of St. Louis consists of a board of police commissioners, having control over the department; one chief, with the rank of colonel, and a salary of $5,000 a year; one assistant chief, with the rank of lieutenant-colonel, and salary of $3,800; one chief of detectives, with the rank of major, salary $3,500; twelve captains, salary $2,400 each a year; twelve lieutenants, salary $1,500 each a year; one superintendent, salary $800 a year; one inspector, with rank of major, salary $2,500 a year; one assistant chief of detectives, with the rank of lieutenant, salary $1,800 a year; secretary to the chief, salary $2,000; 100 sergeants, salary $1,380 each a year; 850 patrolmen, whose pay is $90.00 a month, and 250 probationary patrolmen, whose pay is $65 a month. The general headquarters are in the Four Courts with the headquarters of the mounted police in Forest Park.

Police Relief Fund.—A fund established in 1867 for the relief of sick and disabled members who have been retired on account of age. It is under control of the Police Relief Association. Members pay $1 00 a month, which entitles them to the benefits. The association gives an annual entertainment which is generally well patronized by citizens, and the proceeds of which are a considerable addition to the fund. In 1898 the association had paid out $1,000,000 in benefits, veterans receiving $20.00 a month, and sick members $1.50 a day—and there were then fifty-eight veterans on the pension list. In addition to the monthly contribution from active members and the receipts from the annual entertainment, the proceeds of sales of unclaimed property and rewards go to the fund.

Police Veterans' Association.—This body, composed of St. Louis policemen, was organized December 11, 1898, at Wenzel's Hall, corner of Eighth and Franklin Avenue,

thirty-nine members joining at the start, with J. D. Morgan for president; Charles Rockon, vice-president; A. F. Laycock, secretary, and John F. Hoestman, treasurer. The purpose of the association is to promote fraternal relations among members and to provide relief in cases of sickness.

Political Parties.—It is refreshing in days of constantly recurring elections and caucuses and ward primaries to revert to the time when St. Louis had no politics. Such a blissful period there was for many, many years after the foundation was laid for this great city. There were discussions, doubtless, of the policies of the French, Spanish and English governments in their relation to the allegiance of the inhabitants, but even in these there were few differences. The seat of the American War of Independence was too remote and communication too difficult and unreliable to admit of partisanship, had there been any other side than hostility to the British. St. Louis was forty-seven years old when the people of the seaboard colonies divided into political parties, which division was on the ratification of the United States Constitution, with Hamilton as the leader of the Federalists, and Jefferson as the champion of restriction of the powers of government. Madison would have continued the peace policy of Jefferson, but the impressment of American sailors, the blockade of American ports, and the unwarranted seizure of American vessels by the British, in 1808, rasped the people into the highest state of war feeling; and, with such champions as Clay, Calhoun and Crawford on their side, all temporizing was borne down. The Federalists of New England opposed the war. In this spirit the Governors of Massachusetts and Connecticut declared the militia should not leave their borders. But the result, and particularly the splendid achievements at sea, by which the American arms were crowned, well-nigh crushed out the Federalist party. Madison was triumphantly reelected. Yet, even after peace was declared, in 1814, the Federalists of New England met in secret convention at Hartford and recommended constitutional amendments to restrict commerce and to forbid the holding of office by foreign-born citizens. The popular idea at the time was that dissolution of the Union was the real object in view; but although the proceedings, published years afterward, did not confirm this, the death-knell of the Federalists as a party had been sounded, and in the election of 1816, Rufus King, their presidential candidate, received but thirty-four electoral votes, against 187 for the Republican, James Monroe; and in 1820 there was no Federalist candidate. In 1824 no recognized parties existed, and political issues were so little distinctive that the election was called the "scrub race." At this election the candidates were Adams, Clay, Jackson and Crawford, all avowed Republicans. In Missouri, which now voted for President the first time, there was no Crawford ticket in the field. The three electoral districts, voting separately, chose a Clay, a Jackson, and an Adams elector. But before the next presidential election the partisans of Adams and Jackson had become rival political factions, the Jacksonians taking the name of Democrats, and the Adams men that of Republicans, changing it in 1833 to Whigs, from which year until 1856 Democrats and Whigs were the names of the two national parties.

With this running statement of the nomenclature of parties, a brief reference to some of the leading domestic issues may be considered as a part of the genesis of politics in Missouri and St. Louis: The first alarm of the Republicans grew out of the passage of the alien and sedition laws of 1798, which authorized the President to banish any alien whom he might regard as dangerous to the country, or subject him to fine and imprisonment, and imposing heavy fines and penalties for conspiring to oppose any measure of the government, or for libeling the executive or legislative branches. These laws were to remain in force three years. They gave rise to the State Rights party, as the Republicans were then called, and brought out the Kentucky resolutions, drawn by Jefferson, and the Virginia resolutions, by Madison, in 1798. These resolutions declared that the States had delegated by the Constitution only a limited part of their powers to the general government, and what were not expressly granted were reserved to the States, respectively. Kentucky and Virginia repealed the resolutions in 1799, but Kentucky at the same time declared a State might annul an unconstitutional act of Congress. The question of internal improvements, to be carried on by the government, was another leading issue. Federalists favored a system of public works, whereby the

States might be aided in the development of their natural resources; but Jefferson, Madison and Monroe successively opposed this policy, holding that under the Constitution Congress had no power in that direction. Adams' inaugural address in 1825 strongly favored national internal improvements, and was upheld by Clay, whose connection with Adams' administration was the origin of the Jackson, or Democratic, party. The Adams faction, which had been known as National Republicans, took the name of Whigs under the next, or Jackson, administration, and, besides advocating the policy of national internal improvements, favored a high protective tariff on imports, and also indorsed the United States Bank. This national bank was chartered by Congress in 1816 for a period of twenty years, with a capital of $35,000,000, four-fifths in government bonds, the institution to have the custody of the government revenues, and the Secretary of the Treasury to farm out the deposits to twenty-five branches, situated in different parts of the country. It is significant of the adage, "Times change and men change with them," that Ohio, in 1820-1, tried to nullify the National Bank act. Not only did her Legislature indorse the principles of the Virginia and Kentucky resolutions of '98 as having been recognized and adopted by the American people, but went further, and, declaring the Bank of the United States a private corporation, denied the power of the Supreme Court of the United States to determine the political rights of the separate States comprising the Union. A bill renewing the charter passed Congress in 1832, But Jackson vetoed it, and, although four years were yet to run, through Roger B. Taney, his Secretary of the Treasury, removed the government deposits. These deposits, which at first were less than $11,000,000, had, on account of sales of public lands, etc., reached the enormous sum of $41,000,000. Its discounts were $40,000,000 per annum, and at no time was its outstanding circulation less than $12,000,000. The removal produced a tremendous sensation throughout the country. An indignation meeting was held at the St. Louis courthouse, presided over by Dr. William Carr Lane, at which a committee, composed of Edward Bates, Pierre Chouteau, Jr., George Collier, Thornton Grimsley, Henry S. Geyer, and Nathan Ranney, reported strong resolutions against the action of President Jackson. This movement was soon followed by a Democratic ratification meeting, of which Dr. Samuel Merry was president, the committee on resolutions containing the names of Edward Dobyns, John Shade, James C. Lynch, Llewellyn Brown, B. W. Ayres, John H. Baldwin, and Philip Taylor. Of a less partisan character and far more moderate spirit was the meeting of citizens to remonstrate on the course of South Carolina in passing her ordinance declaring the obnoxious protective tariff law of 1828 null, void and of no binding effect. This meeting was held at the courthouse, December 29th, and was participated in by Dr. Robert Simpson, A. S. Magenis, J. L. Murray, Hamilton R. Gamble, Henry S. Geyer, H. Chouteau, and J. Newman, among other prominent citizens. Benton and Barton, in the Senate, and William H. Ashley, in the House of Representatives from Missouri, had voted for the tariff revision of 1824, in which the policy of revenue from imports, with incidental protection, was reversed, and in which increased duties were placed on lead, hemp, iron and wool, doing this to conciliate the votes of Kentucky, Pennsylvania and New York. Even Jackson supported it as a measure to extinguish the war debt, though Adams and Clay sustained it as based on "the American system." But the tariff of 1828, nicknamed the "bill of abominations," was obnoxious throughout the South. Originating with the New England woolen manufacturers, it offered protection to almost every interest that asked for it. It was at this time that Webster, from being a free trader on principle, changed into a protectionist with the changed attitude of Massachusetts. Benton said "the bill was the work of politicians and manufacturers." But South Carolina alone went to the length of holding a convention and giving substantial form to a policy of resistance. Calhoun, who had resigned as Vice-president and been elected to the Senate, flooded the South with tracts upholding nullification and declaring it to be unlawful to pay the duties imposed by this tariff. A show of warlike preparation was made, but there was little response outside the Palmetto State. Indeed, the people of the whole country had caught on to the spirit of preservation of the Union, aroused by the thrilling debate in the Senate between Webster and Haynes. Brushing aside the contention that it was still unsettled whether the powers of the general government were construable by the States or by

the United States Supreme Court, the popular voice of all sections indorsed Webster's exposition of the Constitution. But this was followed by the momentous and powerful proclamation of Andrew Jackson, announcing forcefully and with dignified courage his determination to crush out the South Carolina rebellion at all hazards, and calling on Congress for the necessary aid. It is impossible to read the Jackson papers on this subject without wondering why the Southern people, less than thirty years later, relied upon secession as a warrantable remedy for their complaints, or as the foundation for an independent confederacy. More marvellous that a Governor of Missouri, himself a Jackson in name, and schooled in Jacksonian principles, should have encouraged secession and embroiled his constituency in an inevitable, devastating war. On the other hand, could not the rancor of the radical free States have been softened by the recollection of Northern waywardness or rebellion, of which at one time there was so much at the North?

The meeting at St. Louis, to respond to President Jackson's proclamation, was the largest that had ever been held in the city, and was non-partisan in character. The resolutions spoke of the threatened dissolution of the Union as the worst of evils, questioned the expediency or constitutionality of the remedy proposed by South Carolina, denied the power to annul a law of the United States as not only incompatible with the existence of the Union, but inconsistent with every principle on which the government was founded, and destructive of the objects for which it was formed. Further, the resolutions declared that the Constitution formed a government, not a league; that a State could not possess any right to secede from the Union, and they warmly sympathized with the Union party of South Carolina.

Previous to the nullification ordinance of South Carolina, Jackson, in his message of 1831, recommended a modification of the revenue measures of 1828, declaring that the public debt would be extinguished before his term expired, and that a surplus was not needed. Clay, whilst desiring the reduction of the revenues, contended against reducing the amount of protection afforded by the tariff to manufacturers. Clay's idea prevailed, and the tariff act of 1832 provided as much surplus as before. All the agricultural regions, not alone South Carolina, felt the burden this policy imposed. Congress, therefore, whilst promptly passing the Force bill, which was designed to suppress nullification, placed alongside, at the instance of Mr. Clay, a compromise bill on the subject of the tariff. Both were passed. South Carolina accepted, and repealed the nullification ordinance. Thus the tariff question, which has been so prominent in the politics of the country, instead of being a national issue, has proved to be one, in both North and South, largely depending upon local and corporate interests. The incidental benefit to different classes derived from the imposition of duties exacted from foreign imports upon articles of a kind manufactured or produced in the United States, has always begotten contention. As changes in the conditions of production have shifted, so have the policies of the legislators representing the people affected by such conditions. In the days of Mr. Clay the methods of disposing of surpluses had not reached the eminence of the present time. If they had, the argument of Jackson, that the decrease of the public debt warranted a reduction of the tariff, could have been readily met by going further into debt. But the trouble then, as now, was in protecting all interests alike. This has been seen in every tariff measure ever passed, by whatever party in power. Calhoun, who led the South Carolina nullification movement on the tariff issue, was, between 1810 and 1820, less of a State-rights man than Clay, and in 1816 was one of the most radical protective-tariff men in the Senate. Webster, on the other hand, from being a free-trader in 1824, swung round the circle completely when New England's interests shifted from commerce to manufactures, as one of the results of the War of 1812 with Great Britain, when English importations were cut off. The tariff message of President Cleveland toward the close of his first administration was the cause of his defeat for re-election, but the protective tariff measure of his successor, known as the McKinley act, resulted in his return to the executive chair in 1892. And yet, though a new revenue tariff act was passed by his party in both branches of Congress, it became a law without Mr. Cleveland's signature. The tariff question was wholly ignored by the Republican convention that nominated Fremont in 1856, and the protective declaration on that subject in 1860 was extremely tame. In 1864 and in 1868 it was again shelved, for the war

debt settled the question of high taxation. The liberal Republicans of Missouri, under the lead of Schurz, were strongly opposed to the protection theory, as shown in the platform of the convention that nominated Brown for Governor, but the Greeley and Brown National Liberal Convention relegated the whole tariff question to the people in their respective congressional districts, pledging the nominees not to interfere. The insanity of the Democratic party in nominating Greeley and Brown at New York in 1872 was intensified by its adoption of their platform, word for word.

Removed as was Missouri from the actual theater of politics during the territorial condition, no sooner did the movement for statehood begin than the name became associated with a popular agitation, the most tremendous in the whole history of the United States. The event was the compromise between those who adhered to the doctrine that slave-owners had the constitutional right to carry their property into any of the territory of the United States and be protected, and, on the other side, those who denied such right and demanded that the further spread of slavery be prohibited. The repeal of this compromise in the Kansas-Nebraska admission act, 1854, led to the formation of the new Republican party in 1856, the election of Lincoln in 1860, the attempted secession of most of the slave-holding States, the establishment for a time of the Southern Confederacy, and to one of the bloodiest and most destructive wars ever recorded. The State was born amidst a conflict destined to be irrepressible—one now happily ended, which, whilst it endured, covered the nation with wounds and flooded it with tears.

No partisan conventions were held in the United States from 1787, the first presidential election, until 1832, when Jackson and Clay were opposing candidates; nor were there any party platforms made. The Jackson party in Congress promulgated in the latter year a set of principles, a sort of epitome of the views of their leaders on public questions, but the National Republicans, or Whigs, issued none. In 1836, when the Democrats nominated Van Buren, no platform was put forth, and there was no sectionalism—not any more than in the presidential election of 1828, when Jackson and Calhoun, both slave-owners, had more than seventy electoral votes in the free States against Adams and Rush, where at least forty were necessary to elect the Jackson ticket. The convention system itself, as applied to national politics, dates back no further than 1832, when it was invented by the anti-Masons, and adopted the same year by both the Democrats and National Republicans. The anti-Mason party, by the way, could scarcely be called a national party, and its existence was ephemeral. Historians generally date the origin of the Free-Soil party back to the establishment, in Maryland, of William Lloyd Garrison's paper, the "Liberator," in 1831. Two years after that the anti-slavery party was formed. But Garrison was in the abolition work as early as 1828, when he was associated with a man named Lundy in the publication of "The Genius of Universal Emancipation." It may be remarked, however, that, although at various times the free-soil, emancipation, or abolition sentiment made itself a more or less interesting feature of national politics, it was not until the repeal of the Missouri compromise was agitated that it took substantial or practical form. A phase of the free-soil movement, which grew out of the Mexican War, was not without its bearings in the education of the country on this subject. Whilst the bill for the purchase from Mexico of territory embracing California, Nevada and parts of Arizona, New Mexico, and Colorado was pending in Congress, 1846, David Wilmot, a Democratic member from Pennsylvania, introduced an amendment prohibiting slavery in any portion of said territory. This was known as the "Wilmot proviso." The House adopted it, but it was rejected by the Senate. In the following presidential election, 1848, Van Buren, who ran as the Free-Soil candidate, received a popular vote of 291,263, but John P. Hale, representing the same sentiments, obtained only 156,149 in 1852.

The repeal of the Missouri compromise "fired the Northern heart." The popular branch of the previous Congress, 1853, stood: Democrats, 159; Whigs, 71; Free-Soilers, 4. In the next House the classification was: Democrats, 75; anti-Nebraska men (Republicans and Free-Soilers), 105; Americans (Know-Nothings), 40. After a long struggle, N. P. Banks, of Massachusetts, was elected speaker by the close vote of 103 to 100 cast for Aiken, of South Carolina. The American, or Know-Nothing, party, was the result of the effort to rehabilitate the Whig organization,

which had gone to pieces on the slavery rock. Its chief tenet was opposition to foreigners and Catholics holding office. In some localities, however, the latter inhibition was not insisted on. This new party had some local successes, but was unhorsed in the Virginia State election of 1854, and disappeared after 1856, when it presented Millard Fillmore as its presidential candidate. Fillmore received but eight electoral votes from a single State—Maryland.

The first election for Delegate to Congress from Kansas took place November 29, 1854. A number of Missourians from counties adjoining the Kansas line, and some from a remote distance, undertook to overwhelm the citizens at the polls, as they did also at the election the following spring, for members of the territorial Legislature. Their lawlessness obtained for them the name of "border ruffians." They actually succeeded in carrying the Legislature, and on its meeting in July, 1855, adopted verbatim the State Constitution of Missouri, slavery clauses and all. Scenes of great turbulence followed. The story of the struggle is too long to be repeated here. President Buchanan recognized what was known as the Lecompton pro-slavery Constitution, supported by the Southern Congressmen, opposed by Douglas and most of the Northern Democrats, as well as by all the Republicans. Congress ratified the Lecompton measure, but the Kansas people defeated it by 10,000. Another constitution was adopted at Wyandotte, but Congress refused admission to Kansas, and thus matters stood until, by the secession of the Southern members, the Republicans had control of both branches, when, January 29, 1861, "bleeding Kansas" became a State in the Union.

A most important political event was the decision of the United States Supreme Court in the Dred Scott case, written by Chief Justice Taney. It declared that an act of Congress prohibiting a citizen from holding and owning slaves within the territory of the United States north of 36 degrees 30 minutes, north latitude, was not warranted by the Constitution and was void. The argument was that no slave nor descendant of slaves could be a citizen, or anything but property, which the owner might take from one part of the country to any other. Instead of allaying and settling the slavery question, this decision was but a brand from the burning to extend and intensify the existing bitterness of feeling. In a measure it justified the repeal of the Missouri compromise, which act it maintained was unconstitutional; yet it not only extinguished the doctrine of popular sovereignty in the territories, but denied to the people of the States the right to regulate their own domestic concerns in their own way. Its logical effect would be to perpetuate slavery, and in a sense make every State a slave State. No deliverance from the supreme bench or any other court of law could have produced such a torrent of invective as was hurled upon this tribunal from every quarter, except the South. Senator Douglas, of Illinois, was universally looked upon as the champion of conservative Democratic sentiment, and now the struggle was on to determine whether or not the Democratic party should be committed to the Taney doctrine. In 1858 the Legislature of Illinois was to be elected, which would choose Douglas' successor. This was the year of the famous contest between the "little giant" and Abraham Lincoln. Douglas had quite as serious an undertaking before him as he cared to confront, without encountering the opposition of Mr. Buchanan's administration; but this, too, he had to meet. Douglas was elected Senator, and immediately loomed up as a candidate for the presidential prize of 1860. There was no other Northern Democratic aspirant who cared to enter the race. The convention met at Charleston in April, with a bare majority of delegates in favor of Douglas. After several days spent in the effort to reconcile conflicting views on the slavery question, the pro-slavery platform was rejected by a decided majority, and the delegates from several Southern States withdrew. A number of ineffectual ballots had been taken before the committee on resolutions reported. Adjournment was taken to Baltimore for a date some weeks ahead, and an address published appealing to the Southern Democrats to fill up the vacant delegations. Before the convention reconvened, Mr. Lincoln was nominated by the Republicans at Chicago. Douglas received the regular Democratic nomination, and John C. Breckinridge was named by the seceders. A new political organization, built on the ruins of the Whig and American parties, called the Constitutional Union party, nominated John Bell, of Tennessee, for President, and Edward Everett, of Massachusetts, for Vice-president. Mr. Lincoln's election was a

foregone conclusion. Missouri, by a plurality of less than 500, cast her popular vote for Douglas. Her delegates at Charleston and Baltimore had been mostly Douglas men. Breckinridge's vote sadly disappointed his supporters, who confidently relied on his carrying the State. The election for State officers was held in August of the same year. Claiborne F. Jackson was nominated for Governor by the Democracy at the same convention which named delegates to Charleston. The Republican candidate was James B. Gardenhire. An independent candidate, but little known before, sprang up in the person of Sample Orr. Jackson hesitated about taking sides as between Douglas and Breckinridge, his associations and preferences all inclining him toward the latter; but finally, on the ground of regularity, he publicly announced himself for Douglas, whereupon the Breckinridge Democrats brought out Hancock Jackson. Many of the Breckinridge men, like Senator James S. Green, advised the election of C. F. Jackson, who received 74,446 votes, and was elected by a plurality of nearly 10,000 over Orr, 63,000 over Hancock Jackson, and more than 68,000 over Gardenhire—Orr representing the remnants of the Whig and American parties.

This was the status of political parties in Missouri at the beginning of 1861, just previous to the breaking out of the Civil War. As has been remarked, the first presidential election in Missouri resulted in the choice of one Jackson, one Clay, and one Adams elector; but at that time the lines between the Whig and Democratic parties were not plainly drawn. At the two succeeding elections for President, the Jackson (Democratic) electors were chosen by large majorities. In 1836 the vote of the State was 10,995 for Van Buren, and 7,337 for William Henry Harrison. In 1840, the "Hard Cider and Log Cabin" campaign, Van Buren again triumphed. At the fifteenth presidential election, 1844, the rival candidates were James K. Polk and Henry Clay, and again the Democrats were successful. The same result occurred in 1852, 1856 and 1860, when Louis Cass, James Buchanan and Stephen A. Douglas, respectively, obtained the electoral vote. So that, from 1828 down to and including 1860, the Democracy was in the ascendency in Missouri. In 1864 the State was carried by Lincoln, and in 1868 by Grant. In 1872, after the "re-enfranchisement," the Grant electors were beaten by more than 42,000, and Missouri returned to her ancient allegiance, steadily voting the Democratic ticket ever since.

During the Civil War the party in power had to deal with the difficult questions relating to the means of supporting the army and navy and meeting other enormous additions to the ordinary expenses of the government. At its close came the work of removing the vestiges of slavery, perpetuating the civil rights of the freedmen, and reconstructing the Southern States upon the new order of affairs. It is unquestionable that the brutal assassination of President Lincoln added greatly to the embarrassment of the situation. The thirteenth amendment to the Constitution was signed by Lincoln a little more than two months before this event, and went into effect in December, 1865. The fourteenth was proposed the following year, and was adopted in 1868, whilst the fifteenth became operative in March, 1870. During the five years intervening the country was in a state of intense political excitement. President Johnson attempted to carry out the policy of his predecessor in refusing to concede that the secession States were ever out of the Union, whilst such leading Republicans as Senator Wade, of Ohio, insisted upon treating them as conquered provinces. This conflict brought about the impeachment of Johnson, whose trial, however, resulted in acquittal through the failure to obtain the necessary two-thirds of the Senate. Among those Senators voting for acquittal was Henderson, of Missouri, and President Johnson was saved by but a single vote. Two years after the election of Grant and Colfax, who defeated Greeley and Brown in 1872, the Democrats carried the lower house of Congress for the first time since 1861, securing a majority of between fifty and sixty, partially as a result of the panic of 1873, but largely on account of alleged scandalous conduct in official quarters. This victory was followed in 1876 by the Tilden-Hayes election, the creation of the electoral commission, and the famous eight to seven decision in favor of Rutherford B. Hayes. During this presidential campaign there appeared what was named the "Greenback" party, with Peter Cooper, of New York, as the candidate. At that time, however, this organization polled but 81,740 votes in the United States. The Greenback party originated in 1873, with the farming interests as a nucleus, under the name

of "Patrons of Husbandry," or "Grangers." In 1874 the Republicans of Missouri sought to utilize that organization by uniting with them at the State election, adopting the name of "People's party," for the nominee of which, William Gentry, for Governor, 112,104 votes were cast, against 149,566 for Charles H. Hardin, Democrat. At the subsequent election for President, in 1876, the Missouri Republicans had a ticket of their own in the field for both national and State elections, and have not since "strayed after strange gods." The Greenback party in 1880 nominated James B. Weaver, of Iowa, and in 1884 Benjamin F. Butler for President, the former receiving a popular vote of 307,306, and the latter of 133,825, in all the States, and thereafter disappeared. From 1872 down to 1892, the Prohibitionists have had a presidential candidate in the field at every election, and there have, during this period, been other political associations, flying the flags of "Labor Union," "United Labor," "Socialist Labor," etc., whose votes may be placed in the scattering column. The People's, or Populist, party had its genesis in the Knights of Husbandry, otherwise known as Farmers' Alliance, or Grangers, and appeared in the year 1891, gradually absorbing remnants of the old Greenback and labor parties. It advocated the abolition of national banks, the control by the government of the telegraph and railroad lines, a tax on incomes, etc. At first it borrowed from Senator Stanford, of California, the idea of government loans, to the extent of 2 per cent of the value, upon stored agricultural products, but this was abandoned. Though the Populist party was not the originator of the policy of free silver coinage at the ratio of 16 to 1 of gold, that policy became its chief tenet, and was the basis of its coalition, in 1896, with the Democratic party on the nomination for President. In the campaign of that year the Populists nominated William J. Bryan, of Nebraska, for President—who had been selected by the Democratic party for the same office—but declined to accept the latter's nominee for Vice-President, putting up Thomas E. Watson instead.

Thus the political history of the country shows the existence of six principal parties, namely: Federalist, or Hamiltonian, 1789 to 1817, twenty-eight years; Republican, or Jeffersonian, 1791 to 1829, thirty-eight years; National Republican, 1826 to 1834, eight years; Democratic, 1829 to date (1898), sixty-nine years; Whig, 1834 to 1854, twenty years; Republican, 1854 to date (1898), forty-four years. Washington and the elder Adams were Federalists; Jefferson, Madison and Monroe, Republicans; John Quincy Adams, National Republican; William Henry Harrison, Tyler, Taylor and Fillmore, Whigs; Jackson, Van Buren, Pierce, Buchanan and Cleveland, Democrats; Lincoln, Johnson, Grant, Hayes, Garfield, Arthur, Benjamin Harrison and McKinley, Republicans. Besides these six principal political parties, there have been thirteen independent parties claiming electoral votes, to-wit: Anti-Masonic, which in 1832 cast about 30,000 popular votes for William Wirt for President; Liberty, which in 1840 gave James G. Birney 7,059, and four years later, 62,300 votes; Free-Soil, which in 1848 gave Van Buren 291,260 votes, and 136,150 in 1852 for John P. Hale; American (Know-Nothing), 1856, Millard Fillmore, 874,534; Constitutional Union, John Bell, 589,581; Prohibition, 1872, James Black, 5,608, in 1876 for Green Clay Smith, 9,522, in 1880, Neal Dow, 10,303, in 1884, John P. St. John, 151,809, in 1888, Clinton B. Fisk, 250,000, in 1892, John Bidwell, 264,133; Greenback, 1880, for James B. Weaver, 307,306, and in 1884 Benjamin F. Butler, 133,825; Union Labor, 1888, Alson J. Streeter, 148,105; United Labor, same year, R. H. Cowdrey, 2,808; Socialist Labor, 1892, Simon Wing, 21,164; National Democratic, 1896, John M. Palmer, 132,871; Populist, 1892, James B. Weaver, 1,041,028; 1896, Bryan and Watson, 150,643. The foregoing does not include the Liberal Republican party, Greeley, 1872, whose vote can not be separated from that cast by the Democrats for the same candidate. In 1872 a section of the Democracy gave 29,408 votes for Charles O'Conor. None of these parties, leaving out the Liberal Republicans, received any electoral votes except the Anti-Masonic, 7; the American, 8; the Constitutional Union, 39, and the Populist, 1892, 22. But independent parties have not been without influence in balancing political power. Thus, the Liberty party, with its 62,300 votes all told, defeated Clay in 1844 by giving the vote of New York to Polk, and the Free-Soilers, reversing the order in 1848, defeated Cass and elected Taylor. In neither case, however, was its own cause advanced.

Politics and the Civil War.—The secession of the cotton States abandoned the Northern Democracy to their fate at a time when the party had possession of both branches of Congress. But infinitely worse in this purely political sense was the course of the Democratic administration of Missouri toward those by whom it had been elected. A great majority of the leading Democrats of the State were Union men, and could not be swerved from their natural alliance even by the persecutions and excesses of those who came to use the name of loyalty for partisan and selfish ends. In defying the Federal authority, as Governor Jackson did in his response to Lincoln's call for volunteers, and in undertaking to remove the seat of government, thus inviting to our soil the horrors of civil war, the secessionists dealt a most stunning blow, not to the Union, but to the political party which had ruled the State from the beginning of its existence. The State Convention, which had, March 9, 1861, declared that there was no cause compelling Missouri to dissolve its connection with the Union, reassembled in July, vacated the offices of Governor, Lieutenant-Governor, and Secretary of State, together with the members of the Legislature, and ordered new elections to be held the following November. Hamilton R. Gamble, Willard P. Hall and Mordecai Oliver, respectively, were chosen for the vacancies in the offices first named. No one of these was a Republican. In October the convention reassembled in St. Louis and ordained that all civil officers should take an oath of allegiance to the Constitution and government of the United States, and not to bear arms against the latter or the provisional government of Missouri. An ordinance was passed to postpone the State elections till November, 1862, and another offering amnesty to all taking the oath of allegiance. From June 13, 1861, until the last of July there was practically no State government, Jackson and his followers having fled before the troops of General Lyon, which by this time numbered nearly 10,000. About the time of the establishment of the provisional government, Lieutenant-Governor Reynolds appeared at New Madrid and issued a grandiloquent proclamation to the people of Missouri. A meeting of the Legislature, composed of many of the old members, with recruits, was held at Neosho, in the southwest corner of the State, in October, and an agreement ratified whereby commissioners were to transfer the State of Missouri over to the Southern Confederacy. This farce was further carried out by the election by the rump Legislature of Senators and Representatives in the Confederate Congress at Richmond. Several of the members of the Neosho Legislature, disgusted with the whole business, returned to their homes. Among these was Charles H. Hardin, who was several years afterward elected Governor of the State.

The State Convention, which had perpetuated itself from early in 1861, again met on the 3d of June at the capital. Meantime, Robert Wilson and John B. Henderson had been appointed by Acting Governor Hall to fill the vacancies in the United States Senate occasioned by the expulsion of Trusten Polk and Waldo P. Johnson. The convention continued the provisional government till the next general election in 1864. It disqualified all who had taken up arms on the Confederate side subsequent to December 17, 1861, from voting or holding office, except on condition of taking the oath to thereafter support the national and State Constitutions, and requiring a similar oath of voters. At this session a bill for an ordinance looking to gradual emancipation was introduced by Honorable Samuel M. Breckinridge, of St. Louis, which was defeated by a vote of 52 to 19. In the elections of 1862 for Congress and members of the Legislature, the issue was between the Emancipationists and Democrats, the former carrying all the Congressional districts but the Sixth and Eighth. In the First district of St. Louis, the Democratic candidate was Louis Vital Bogy, who received 2,536 votes; Samuel Knox, Radical Emancipationist, 4,590, and Francis P. Blair, gradual emancipation—with deportation of negroes—4,743. The Democrats were left in a large minority in the Legislature. John B. Henderson was elected Senator for the long, and B. Gratz Brown for the short term. Brown received 74 votes, and James O. Broadhead 64; Henderson, 84; John S. Phelps, 42. In 1864 Lincoln carried the State by a vote of 71,676 against 31,626. At the same time Thomas C. Fletcher (Rep.) was elected Governor by about the same majority over Thomas L. Price (Dem.). There was also an election to decide whether there should be a new constitutional convention. The affirmative of this proposition carried by a still larger majority. The Republicans swept the State for members of Congress and the Legis-

lature. Emancipation was still a leading issue in the public discussions, but it was overshadowed by the question of disfranchisement. Stringent registration laws had been enacted, and officers to enforce the same appointed by the Governor in every county, with supervisors in the several senatorial districts, forbidden to enroll any person as a voter without his taking an iron-clad oath of loyalty, and empowered to refuse the franchise, even with this condition, according to their own judgment. These registration laws, as administered by reckless registers and supervisors, disqualified thousands on the mere suspicion of disloyalty.

The State convention ordered in 1865 met at Mercantile Library Hall, in St. Louis, January, 1865, the members having been chosen at the preceding election in anticipation of the people's verdict. Arnold Krekel, of St. Charles, was elected president, and Charles D. Drake, of St. Louis, vice-president. In a few days an ordinance was passed, 60 to 4, abolishing slavery, and soon after the famous sweeping test oath, applicable to voters, jurors, all civil officials, teachers and ministers of the Gospel. (See "Test Oath.") In March an ordinance was adopted, known as the "ousting ordinance," vacating all the county offices and judgeships of the supreme and circuit courts, giving power to the Governor to appoint their successors. In the exercise of his discretion Governor Fletcher left undisturbed such officials as were deemed loyal. The executive ax fell with greatest expedition on the members of the bench, for it would not do to have them pass upon the question whether the retroactive clauses of the State organic law then making were in accordance with the Constitution of the United States. Two of the judges of the Supreme Court—John D. S. Dryden and Walter V. N. Bay—refused to vacate their offices, whereupon General D. C. Coleman, acting under orders from the Governor, took them into custody, along with the clerk of the court, when the recalcitrants submitted to the show of force. At the election, June 6, 1865, to ratify the new Constitution, a total of only 85,000 votes were cast, and the instrument was declared adopted by a majority of about 1,800. The silent opposition to the new Constitution shown by a falling off of 55,000 votes from the election of the previous year, soon manifested itself in the open hostility of the conservative loyalists, such as Francis P. Blair, B. Gratz Brown, Carl Schurz, S. M. Breckinridge, Emil Preetorius, of the Republican side, with, of course, all the Unionists of Democratic tendencies, like Samuel T. Glover, James O. Broadhead and John S. Phelps. Nevertheless, by the machinery put in operation by the new Constitution, the Twenty-fourth General Assembly, elected in 1866, chose Charles D. Drake, United States Senator, to succeed B. Gratz Brown. Again, in 1868, the national issues and the candidacy of General Grant for President overshadowed all local questions, and Joseph W. McClurg, for Governor, with E. O. Stanard for Lieutenant-Governor, carried the State by 19,327 majority, Grant's majority being about 6,000 more. At this election John S. Phelps and Norman J. Colman were the Democratic candidates for Governor and Lieutenant-Governor.

The foregoing covers the more prominent features of Missouri politics during the war period and immediately following. Much wrangling and turbulence were caused by the operation of the disqualifying clauses of the new Constitution, especially the test oath for ministers. These will be considered under the title of "Politics and Disfranchisement."

Politics and Disfranchisement.—An oath of allegiance to constituted authority may properly be demanded of all officials, or from an alien seeking citizenship, and in other cases. This kind of declaration is in the nature of a promise, and is not exacted as a test. A test oath, on the other hand, is meant as a method of disproving what, in a general sense, is suspected of the taker, and as a prohibition. Thus, in England and Scotland, after the reformation, no one could hold office without having received the holy communion of the established church. No religious test is permitted by the Constitution of the United States, but the various test oaths adopted by military commanders during the Civil War, and notably by the Missouri Constitution of 1865, were calculated to reach the consciences no less than the overt acts of those in either open or secret rebellion. The oath prescribed by the Constitutional Convention of the State in 1861 merely required allegiance or loyalty to the national and State Constitutions of all civil officers, with a pledge not to take up arms against the government of the State or nation. In June, 1862, an ordinance was passed disqualifying from voting any person who had "directly or indirectly given aid or comfort to

the enemies thereof," subsequent to December 17, 1861, the date of an amnesty offered by Governor Gamble. This was generally regarded as a legitimate measure of protection. But it was followed soon after by all manner of proscriptive oaths formulated by several military commanders. Thus there was the Schofield oath, the Curtis oath, the Halleck oath, etc. The Halleck oath, on which the famous Drake steel-clad test oath was founded, created the profoundest consternation. (See "Test Oath.") It was in the form of a general order directing the president and all other officers of the State University to take the convention oath within a month on penalty of being ousted, and at the same time "recommending" all ministers and teachers, and all officers of every sort of public institution to do likewise. This was improved on, so to speak, by General Rosecrans, who, March 7, 1864, issued his order No. 61, commanding that all persons attending any religious convention should file with the provost marshal, in addition to the ordinary forms, an oath disclaiming all faith in, and allegiance to, the Confederate armies, pledging their honor, property and lives to the sacred performance of this oath of allegiance, etc. A strong protest was made to President Lincoln by a number of distinguished clergymen, including Drs. McPheeters, Brooks, Farris and Anderson, who interpreted it as meaning that the government would permit them to obey their Divine Master if they would first swear fealty to it, and not otherwise. The President rescinded the order and condemned it as unwise. But it was not until the Drake Constitution went into effect that the greatest popular revolt was made against the test oath of conscience. A great number of ministers of the Gospel of all denominations either refused to pursue their vocation or openly defied the law. In his book called "Martyrdom in Missouri" Rev. Dr. Leftwich has left a record of hundreds of cases of arrest and imprisonment. It is hardly to be doubted that many of the preachers thus "martyred" declined to take the oath, simply because they could not conscientiously do so, and there seems to be but little room to question that some of them had let no occasion pass to sow the seeds of rebellion; but the war was now over, and these political preachers were powerless to do the Union any hurt. The most noted instance of arrest for conscience's sake, because it was the means of bringing the test oath before the courts, was that of Rev. J. A. Cummings, a Catholic priest, of Pike County, who was indicted, tried, convicted and sent to jail for preaching without having taken the oath of loyalty. The State Supreme Court had affirmed the finding of the circuit court, and an appeal was taken to the highest tribunal at Washington. One hundred or more indictments were pending at the time in various parts of Missouri. Alexander J. P. Garesche appeared for Father Cummings in the earlier trials of the suit, but at the presentation of the case to the United States Supreme Court that side was represented by David Dudley Field, Reverdy Johnson and Montgomery Blair, John B. Henderson and George P. Strong appearing for the State. This was in March, 1866. The decision reversed the lower courts, and the reasoning of the opinion was such as to reach almost the entire disqualifying features of the third section of the Constitution of 1865. (Wallace, 1867, Volume IV, page 277.)

Another famous case which brought that part of the test oath relating to voters before the same court was that of Blair v. Ridgeley, an election judge. General Blair appeared at the polls with the written form of an oath, which he proposed to take, declaring that he had been loyal since the new Constitution went into effect. He declined to take that part of the Drake declaration which related to acts done or sympathy felt previous to that date, holding that it was retroactive, *ex post facto* and unconstitutional, the election officer, therefore, having no right to require him to subscribe to the same. As was expected, Blair's vote, on the condition named, was refused, and suit for damages was at once instituted, and, as in the Cummings case, carried through the lower courts to the Supreme tribunal of the United States, where, after a magnificent display of legal and forensic strength by Samuel T. Glover, on one side, and Charles D. Drake on the other, the court divided, four to four, and Blair's case was lost. It was not long, however, before the people of Missouri swept out of existence, as with a besom, the whole fabric of the Drake test oath, and later the Constitution, of which it was so hideous a feature. Their authors had sown the wind, and they reaped the whirlwind.

Politics, Liberal Party.—The Liberal Republican party of this city, State and

nation was brought into being by Charles Daniel Drake. In his day he was the very quintessence of ultraism. His enthusiasm was never checked, nor his pace bridled. As a State legislator he was both fanatic and bigot. He perceived no inconsistency in anything he did, but it would have made no difference had he done so. Christian he was, but of that type which, according to Byron:

> "... Have burned each other, quite persuaded
> That all the apostles would have done as they did."

The swath of his moral scythe lopped every wayside lily that bore a human taint. A Democrat of the strictest pro-slavery sect before the war, and regarded as an extremist by many of his fellow-Democrats, he was the fiercest, most unyielding of the Radicals, whose commanding officer he became, though never wearing epaulet or sword. With scarcely an element of personal popularity, grizzly, stern, cold, obstinate, the force of his irrepressible leadership stamped itself, as with a brand, upon the whole State. Glover, Broadhead, Blair, Henderson, Gamble, Schurz, Gratz Brown, and all the shining galaxy of Unionists associated with the earliest struggles of the war, were brought face to face with this new electrician of the politics of Missouri, and paled their ineffectual fires in the presence of his singular power. Blair had been rotten-egged by pro-slaveryites, and threatened with the guardhouse by Fremont. Disappointments had come to others in their military or political aspirations. But Drake deliberately went to work to organize a party on the basis of eternal hate, seemingly not averse to the tribute on the part of his opponents of a respectful scorn. To him the word "Radical" was not a nickname, but a term of praise; rather a decoration than a slur. Original Unionists, if disposed to win rebels over by conciliatory measures, were, in his view, little better than the rebels themselves. Loyalty to the government; service in the Federal Army, with wounds and privations; sincere desire for peace, with rebellion crushed forever—these were not enough. There must be no amnesty, no forgiveness. The Drakonian rule was: "Once a rebel, always a traitor." The fruits of victory were to be a heritage for the saviors of the Union alone, for them and their posterity. A heaping share of the burdens of the government were to be borne by those who had sought to destroy, alike with those who had maintained and preserved it; but it was deemed sufficient for them that they were permitted to live under the beneficent rule of patriots, without participation in public affairs.

At this day it seems strange that such harsh doctrine found lodging in the breasts of men, even though inflamed by the rage of party spirit and the unreasoning passion of the time. It was as a kind of political disease, at one period taking an epidemic form, but finally subsiding, though leaving behind it a world of distressing memories. Long before President Lincoln had given warning of his famous emancipation proclamation Drake and his co-laborers here had urged this policy. They sent a delegation to Washington, of which Drake was chairman, with an address to the President full of fiery denunciation of the South, and of rebellion, and of slavery, urging immediate, unconditional and universal manumission. To this Mr. Lincoln quietly replied that, with the military lines where they were, such a proclamation would be "like the Pope's bull against the comet." But Drake was undeterred. His caustic pen and snap-shot voice were constantly employed. He complained that the ministry, especially of the Catholic, Methodist and Baptist Churches, were soaked with treason. There was no loyalty in the schools. The learned professions were tainted. And so matters drifted along, the Radicals elbowing out the Conservatives, until, in 1864, a proposition to amend the old Constitution was, by the Legislature, submitted to popular vote, and carried by 29,000 majority. Drake was elected to the convention, which met January 6, 1865, at Mercantile Library Hall, St. Louis, and was vice-president of that body, Judge Arnold Krekel being elected president. From that moment for five full years, Charles D. Drake became the most potent influence in Missouri. He swayed the convention as he would his class in Sunday-school. All eyes turned to him for the signals of action. No man ever welcomed responsibility with less fear or more confidence. With his own clear chirography, as legible and unblotted as copper-plate, he wrote all the sections prescribing the various declarations of loyalty and test oaths to be required of clergymen, teachers, office-holders and voters, and with hoarse eloquence he supported and carried them in the convention. This was what came to be known as the "Drakonian Code," and the Constitution as the "Drake Constitution," because they

were the very lineaments and hereditaments of Charles D. Drake himself.

Under the title "Political and Civil War" are shown the operation and political effects of the iron-clad oath administered to almost all classes in Missouri after the adoption of the Drake Constitution of 1865. Only the most radical of the Radicals could justify, excuse or palliate the wholesale proscription of the registration officials. Glover, Broadhead and Blair were bold in denouncing the arbitrary and revengeful policy of the pluperfect Unionists, who, in the name of loyalty, were persecuting their political opponents. "With love for the people and rigid economy on its faithless lips," said Glover, "it has robbed the public treasury, corruptly squandered the public property and betrayed its public trusts for base bribes." By this time (1868) those anti-Democrat Unionists who had not been driven out of the Republican party had begun to fret and chafe under a rule which, three years after peace had been proclaimed, was even more proscriptive than during the height of the war. In their State platform, July, 1868, the Republicans, recognizing the growth of a more liberal sentiment, declared that they "cherish no revengeful feeling toward those who fought in fair and open battle, though for an unjust cause, and stand ready to restore to them every political privilege at the earliest moment consistent with State and national safety." This was a mere sop. Those who fought in battle formed a very small proportion of the disfranchised element. The declaration was perfunctory and heartless, being a temporizing expedient only. Had it been made pending a State, instead of a presidential, election it would have been openly condemned by the conservative Republicans; but the candidacy of Grant solidified the Republican party as a body upon national issues, and placed the disfranchisement question in the background for the time being.

Meanwhile many of the Union leaders of the city and State, who had co-operated with that party during the war, had dropped this alliance, and were seeking to impress their conservatism on the national Democracy, among them Blair, Broadhead, Glover, Thomas T. Gantt, with others of less distinction. General Blair's friends urged him for the presidency as a representative of the opposition to what was claimed to be a growing tendency toward "Caesarianism," or subordinating the civil to military rule. Though he failed to secure this prize, General Blair was nominated for the vice-presidency. In the State election of 1868 the powers of the supervisors of registration were exercised with unsparing rigidity, so that some of the heaviest Democratic counties, such as Audrain, Cooper, Lafayette, Lincoln, Marion and Saline, returned Republican majorities running into the hundreds. The counties of Dunklin, Jackson, Monroe, Oregon, Platte, Ripley, Shannon and Wayne, which went Democratic, even under the purging of the election lists by the county and district registrars, were thrown out by Secretary of State Rodman. By this means certificates of election were issued to several Republican candidates for Congress, who had been defeated on the popular vote as cast. We shall see, anon, how the element of liberalism had diffused itself over the State in spite of all efforts to repress it. In January, 1867, Mr. Drake had been elected to the Senate, displacing B. Gratz Brown, and in 1869 there came the question of the successorship to General John B. Henderson. Henderson, although the author of the Fifteenth Amendment, had, in the minds of the Radicals, disqualified himself for any further political power, both by his vote for the acquittal of President Johnson in the impeachment trial, and by his strong advocacy of the early restoration of all white men in Missouri to the privilege of suffrage. Nevertheless he was not entirely out of the race. Other aspirants were Carl Schurz, Governor Fletcher, Colonel W. D. Gilmore, Colonel Benjamin, and General Benjamin F. Loan. Loan was supported by Drake, who declared that if Schurz were elected, his—Drake's—power in the control of the patronage would be annihilated. It soon transpired that the contest was between Loan and Schurz. The latter won the first battle in the election of Orrick, of St. Charles, for Speaker. Governor McClurg's message entreated the Legislature not to call a State convention to amend the Constitution. "Better," said he, "to tolerate for years any objectionable features than to have a convention and the people dragged three times to the polls to effect that end." Orrick, Baker, of Schuyler; Wells Blodgett, of Johnson; Mullings, of Greene; Hays, of Buchanan, and others, had taken ground in favor of coupling with negro suffrage the enfranchisement of the rebel sympathizers; but McClurg declared the two propositions were like oil and water, and could not harmonize. He con-

tended that the rebels still enjoyed life and property, which was more than they were entitled to, as they had been forfeited by disloyalty. During this senatorial contest the bitterest denunciations were launched at the "Missouri Democrat," then edited by Colonel William M. Grosvenor. Loan denounced it as a traitor sheet. Drake curled his sneering lip at its course, as designed to give aid and comfort to rebellious Democrats. Finally the eventful vote came in the Republican caucus. A single ballot decided the conflict—Schurz, 60; Loan, 40; Benjamin, 9; scattering, 5. This was the knell of Radicalism in Missouri. The death rattle was in its throat, and, although it lingered for another struggle, thenceforth it was at the mercy of its foes.

In July, 1870, the "Westliche Post," organ of Mr. Schurz, came out for B. Gratz Brown as its candidate for Governor at the ensuing November election, followed rapidly by a number of interior German newspapers. The "Missouri Democrat" and several influential English journals fell into line. The Republican Convention met at the capital on the 1st of September. On the third day Congressman Havens reported the platform, the principal resolution of which recited that the party stood ready to remove rebel disqualifications in the same measure that the spirit of disloyalty might die out, and "cordially indorse the submission of amendments removing such disqualifications." It was the old procrastinating, temporizing policy. Mr. Schurz, reporting the minority resolutions, spoke with calmness, and in the clear-cut, pure English which always characterized his utterances, he declared the time had already come for white enfranchisement, and that it was the duty of the Republican party to unequivocally say so. A heated debate followed. The convention was well sprinkled with official representatives of the national and State administrations, and there was little surprise that the result of the vote showed upward of one hundred majority for the Radicals. A scene of great uproar was precipitated upon the convention. So well understood was it that there would be a bolt that a St. Louis newspaper had two sets of reporters on the ground, and a double relay of operators was provided at the telegraph office. The bolt was led by General John McNeil, who invited the Liberals—as they had then come to be known—to assemble in the Senate Chamber. Here the Liberal Convention was at once organized, and proceeded to nominate a State ticket and formulate a platform. The Radicals, at the other end of the capitol, nominated their ticket by acclamation, and thus the two wings began their march to battle—one commanded by Joseph W. McClurg, and the other by B. Gratz Brown. To these captains and their forces was left the entire conflict, the Democracy having resolved upon a policy of abstention as a party organization. The Democracy were generally non-committal in their expressions of preference until after the closing of the books of registration, although the direction of their sympathy could not be doubted. In many places disfranchisement was quite as rigid as it had ever been, but in others, crafty politicians were able to make political trades on local tickets, resulting in a very considerable modification of previous arbitrary conduct on the part of registrars. The official returns were: McClurg, 63,336; Brown, 104,372. In St. Louis the vote was: McClurg, 4,672; Brown, 17,256. At the same time constitutional amendments abolishing the test oath clauses were carried, a Democratic Legislature was elected in both branches, and out of fourteen congressmen, the Radicals got but three. In short, the whole political machinery of the State was revolutionized. No one was quicker to perceive this than Senator Drake. His term was to expire in 1873, but he secured an appointment from President Grant, in 1871, to a life office as judge of the United States Court of Claims. Curiously enough, the Senator had predicted with wonderful precision, while the legislative agitation was going on, what would be the effect of a division in the Republican party on the subject of enfranchisement. Under date of February 21, 1870, he wrote to a friend at Jefferson City, saying: "The result would be in many counties two sets of candidates in our party—one for removal (of rebel disabilities), the other against. The Democrats would win. It would produce a like separation in the tickets for county offices, resulting in a serious division of the party, fatal, perhaps, to its continual ascendency, if not to its existence." Governor McClurg appointed D. T. Jewett, of St. Louis, to fill Mr. Drake's vacancy, but the Legislature of 1873, now largely Democratic, elected Frank P. Blair to the succession, the Union general who, refusing to take the iron-clad oath of loyalty, had been an early victim of disfranchisement. Mr. Drake served with

distinguished ability on the bench of the Court of Claims until 1885, when he retired. He mingled much in the society of Washington, and took an active part as a Presbyterian elder in the work of his church. In his later life the pendulum had swung back, and he became a conservative in politics.

During the first term of General Grant his administration had encountered much criticism. Newspapers like the New York "Tribune," the Springfield (Massachusetts) "Republican," the Hartford "Courant," the Chicago "Tribune" and the Cincinnati "Commercial," were at times exceedingly severe upon what were declared to be the tendencies toward military government and the abuses of the executive department. This gave rise to a movement to nationalize the Missouri idea. It was almost certain that Grant would be a candidate for re-election, and it was believed in many quarters that a combined effort to solidify the opposition might result in defeating that nomination and placing the Republican party on a reformed basis, or the founding of a new party, which should take the place of the old one. To this task the Missouri Liberals set themselves to work with zeal. An extensive correspondence was opened with dissatisfied Republicans throughout the country, and the replies appeared to give assurance of a considerable uprising. Meantime the "Missouri Republican," Democratic newspaper, of St. Louis, was continually pointing out the uselessness of a Democratic ticket at the presidential election, the Southern press responding with singular unanimity. A call to the Liberal Republicans of Missouri was issued December 15, 1871, for a State convention to meet at Jefferson City, January 24th following, for the purpose of considering the political situation and organizing for the presidential election. It was a strong representative body. Resolutions were adopted demanding "genuine reform of the tariff, so that those duties shall be removed which, in addition to the revenue yielded to the treasury, involve increase in the price of domestic products and a consequent tax for the benefit of favored interests." The resolutions also denounced the "shameless abuse of government patronage," the "growing encroachment of executive power," the "bristling of bayonets about State conventions," and the "prostitution of the name of an honored party to selfish interests," closing with an invitation to all Republicans desirous of reform to meet in national mass convention at the city of Cincinnati, May 1st. This call met with an apparently spontaneous and widespread response from the opponents of General Grant's administration, and embraced the names of distinguished Republicans not before known to be disaffected. Among them were Cassius M. Clay, Stanley Matthews, Lyman Trumbull, Charles Francis Adams, Joseph M. Scovill, Theodore Tilton, John Cochran, ex-Secretary of the Interior Jacob D. Cox, George Hoadley, J. B. Stallo, and many others of like character. Salmon P. Chase was quoted as being a warm sympathizer in the movement, and afterward wrote a letter saying he would not decline a nomination for President on the issues presented by its friends.

The convention, when it met in Cincinnati, May 1st, was an exceedingly large and impressive body. Judge Stanley Matthews, of Ohio, was the temporary, and Carl Schurz the permanent president. The declaration of principles arraigned General Grant for usurping the government for the promotion of personal ends, with much other extremely severe and caustic criticism. The sixth resolution of the platform, "recognizing that there are in our midst honest but irreconcilable differences of opinion with regard to the respective systems of protection and free trade, remitted the discussion of the subject to the people in their respective districts, and the decision of Congress thereon, wholly free from executive interference or dictation." The first ballot for President resulted: Charles Francis Adams, 205; Lyman Trumbull, 110; David Davis, 92; Horace Greeley, 147; B. Gratz Brown, 95. Before the second ballot was taken, Governor Brown, who had suddenly appeared in Cincinnati the night before, took a proxy from one of the Missouri delegates, and, in a speech, withdrew his name in favor of Greeley, who was nominated on the sixth ballot, the vote being: Greeley, 482; Adams, 187. The vote of the Missouri delegation was by no means unanimous for Greeley, notwithstanding the position of Governor Brown. Indeed, he was the only prominent Missourian favoring it. General Schurz, when Brown had released his friends from their pledge to him, was active within the time left for action in the effort to place Charles Francis Adams at the head of the ticket, with Trumbull for the second place, but the endeavor proved inef-

fectual. The powerful influence of the New York "Tribune" in the East, on account of the notable anti-slavery record of its founder and the softening effect of Greeley's peace efforts during the war, together with the circumstance of his going on the bail bond of Jefferson Davis, were thought to be elements of popular strength that must make a tremendous showing at the polls. In the canvass Mr. Greeley acquitted himself with a prudence and ability that astonished friends and foes alike, while his associate candidate, on the other hand, became the butt of ridicule. At one time some of the earliest and most prominent promoters of the Liberal movement had it seriously in mind to request Governor Brown to retire from the race. Indeed, from the time when the National Democratic Convention indorsed the Cincinnati nominees and adopted their platform, it seemed almost a foregone conclusion that Grant's election was assured, as was verified by the event. The end of it all was that Greeley died before the meeting of the electoral college, Brown retired to political obscurity, and nothing was again known of the Liberal Republican party as an entity either in the country at large or the place of its birth.

Politics, Passive Policy.—In 1860 the total vote of the State of Missouri for presidential electors was 163,519. Eight years later it was but 145,459. At this election, John S. Phelps, a Union Democrat, whom Lincoln had appointed Provisional Governor of Arkansas during the war, was beaten more than 19,000 votes by Joseph W. McClurg. Manifestly all further effort to win a Democratic victory whilst so many thousand voters were disfranchised was useless, if not ridiculous. "Octavius had a party, and Antony a party, but the commonwealth had none." This was at once recognized by the Democratic press of the State, led by the "Missouri Republican." In the defeat of the amendment to the constitution striking out the word "white," which was effected by a majority of about 20,000, and later in the rapidly developing opposition to Grant's administration, there was seen a strong tendency against Radicalism, and the question arose how to make the most of it. The proscriptive features of the new constitution, and particularly the indignation of the clergy of all denominations, were not the least of the elements bearing on the situation. Some of the old "wheel-horses" of the Democracy, such as Colonel D. H. Armstrong, John S. Phelps and Louis V. Bogy, at first strenuously antagonized the policy proposed by the "Republican," the St. Joseph "Gazette," and Kansas City "Times," of making no further nominations for State offices, but after months of discussion, the Democracy became nearly unanimous in the adoption of the "Passive Policy," as it was called. In March, 1870, the Democratic members of the Legislature in caucus declared it inexpedient to call a Democratic convention or to nominate candidates for State offices at the ensuing November election. The chairman of the State Central Committee, whilst willing to forego nominations, thought so important a departure from usage should alone be determined by a convention. Finally the State committee settled the matter by issuing an address announcing that no convention would be called, and setting forth the reasons for abstention. In this the party acquiesced with remarkable unanimity. Thus the political field was abandoned altogether to the Republicans, so far as a State ticket was concerned. There had been no consultation of any kind between the Democratic and Liberal leaders, and therefore no pledges, no alliances. It was tacitly understood that in localities where the Democrats had a chance of electing local officers, members of the Legislature, etc., they would support their own nominees; but as between the rival Republican State tickets, for the most part, stand aloof, at least until the close of the registration. The general result has been given in the preceding article, "Politics, Liberal Party." At the same election wherein the Radical candidate for Governor was defeated by 40,000 majority, the proscriptive features of the third section of article two of the Drake Constitution were swept away by a tremendous majority. Under a greatly modified administration of the registration law, due in a degree to coquetting for Democratic support, the total vote had increased to 166,625. Four years later it was 277,986. The population of the State had grown from 1,182,000 in 1860, to 1,719,978 in 1870.

The platform of the Radical Republican Convention of February, 1872, proclaimed the Republican party of Missouri to be "now united, vigorous and enthusiastic," and that it would "poll the full vote of the State for the nominees of the National Republican Conven

tion"; that the then "so-called Liberal Republican faction, if considered apart from the Democratic party—as it should not be—is contemptible in numbers, too feeble to organize, and too cunning to expose its weakness by a separate organization—a mere clique of disaffected persons," etc. The Democratic party, in June of that year, proclaimed that prior to the last general election in this State the large majority of citizens were powerless, and it was by the patriotism and sense of justice of the Liberal Republican party that the citizens had been made freemen. It declared it the duty of the Democracy to co-operate with the Liberal Republicans, that it would be unwise to place another Democratic ticket in the field for President and Vice-president, and instructing the delegates appointed to the Baltimore Convention to vote as a unit against any candidates for President and Vice-president at the approaching election. This was the application of the "Passive Policy," which had been productive of such momentous results in this State to National politics. Much the same condition of affairs existed throughout the country as in Missouri, though not nearly so intensified in regard to proscription. The overwhelming defeat of Seymour and Blair, who had carried but eight States as against twenty-six for Grant and Colfax, with reconstruction of the South incomplete, and with the new element of the negro vote added to disfranchisement of thousands upon thousands of the whites, left no ground for hope that any Democrat could attain the presidency in 1872. The Democracy, however, could not be disinterested spectators of the struggle going on in the ranks of the Republican party against Radicalism. It was the conviction of the Missouri Democrats that the abstention of the party from participation in the election of that year would be both politic and patriotic. They believed that any presidential nomination on their part would tend to harmonize the discordant elements of the Republican party, whereas their absence from the field would develop all the opposition to the Grant or dominant faction. They held, also, that any renomination or indorsement of the action of the Liberals would be an embarrassment rather than a help, to say nothing of the implied self-stultification it would involve. This attitude was commended generally throughout the South, many of the ablest journals of that section devoting editorial after editorial to the education of the people up to the Missouri standard. But such counsels did not prevail at the national convention, although vigorously urged by Vest, Broadhead, Brockmeyer and other able delegates from Missouri, and leaders from all over the South. Not only were Greeley and Brown, the Liberal Republican nominees, indorsed and re-nominated, but the Cincinnati platform was reiterated word for word. Possibly the result would have been the same in any case, but certainly what chance there ever was to defeat Grant was lost when Greeley and Brown became the regular nominees of the Democratic party. The Missouri Democracy, however, remained faithful to their obligations and cast their electoral votes with the Liberals. They divided with them the State ticket at the same election. In 1876 the Liberals returned to the regular Republican fold, and their admired leader, Mr. Schurz, accepted a portfolio in the cabinet of President Hayes, where, it is believed, he exerted marked influence for good upon the policy of the administration.

Politics of City Elections.—After the Legislature, December 9, 1822, incorporated the town of St. Louis, vesting the government in a mayor and board of aldermen, and after the citizens, by a close vote of 107 to 90, had adopted the charter, the first election occurred, April 7, 1823. The boundaries of the town were Seventh Street on the west, Mill Creek on the south, and a line from Roy's Tower east to the river on the north, the Mississippi, of course, being the eastern limit. All free white citizens of the age of twenty-one, who had paid a city tax, were eligible voters. A total of 220 votes were cast, of which William Carr Lane received 122, Auguste Chouteau 70, and M. P. Leduc 28. Thomas McKnight, James Kennerly, Archibald Gamble, W. H. Savage, Philip Rocheblave, Robert Wash, James Lakenan, Henry Von Phul and James Loper were chosen aldermen, and Mr. Gamble became president of the board. The following year Mr. Lane had no opposition, and he was elected every succeeding year until 1829, when he retired and was followed by Daniel D. Page, who served three terms of one year each. In 1833 Dr. Samuel Merry was elected, but being United States Receiver at the time, his election was contested and the case decided against him, Mayor Page continuing to serve during the proceedings. At a

special election John W. Johnson was elected. The next mayor, in 1835, was John F. Darby. At this time the city had four wards, each entitled to three aldermen. After serving three terms Mayor Darby was succeeded by the first mayor, William Carr Lane. Not until this year had national politics taken any strong hold upon the people, except in the immediately preceding presidential and congressional elections. Mayor Lane took a prominent part in the condemnation of Jackson's course relative to the veto of the United States Bank Bill, and presided at a meeting called to pass resolutions of censure; but although the feeling in St. Louis was generally with Jackson, it is an evidence of its tolerant character that little objection was made to Lane on this account. In 1840, however, Darby was again elected. The first Democrat elected mayor was John M. Krum, in 1849. Little of interest in a partisan sense attaches to the municipal elections of succeeding years, or through the successive administrations of John D. Daggett, George Maguire, John M. Wimer, Bernard Pratte (two terms), Peter G. Camden, Bryan Mullanphy, John M. Krum, James G. Barry, Luther M. Kennett and John How, bringing the record down to 1855. The party spirit of presidential, State and congressional elections had, indeed, infused itself into some of the municipal contests, but furnished few incidents differing from the general tone. By this time the factional contest between the Benton and anti-Benton men of the Democratic party, growing out of the Claib. Jackson resolutions on the subject of slavery introduced into the State Legislature in 1849, had resulted in the defeat of Benton—1851—at the close of his thirty years' service in the United States Senate, his election to the lower house of Congress for the First (St. Louis) District in 1852, his defeat for re-election to Congress in 1854, and his unsuccessful canvass for Governor in 1856. During this period, and, indeed, for some time before, either the Whigs, who had a considerable element of Bentonism in their party organization, or the Benton Democrats controlled the city government. In 1854 the American or "Know-Nothing" party came forward as the successor of the Whig party, and Kennett, as its representative, was pitted against Benton in the congressional race and was triumphant. On the same wave the next spring Washington King was elected mayor. Then came the great Kansas-Nebraska issue, which swallowed up the American party and made havoc in the ranks of the old National Democracy. John How, who had been a Benton man and was an emancipationist, carried the election in 1856 over John B. Carson, the American candidate, and on tickets representing emancipation, free-soil, "free Republicanism," or kindred issues, John M. Wimer was elected in 1857, and Oliver D. Filley in 1858 and again in 1860. In 1861, one month after the inauguration of President Lincoln, Daniel G. Taylor, Democrat, was pitted against John How, Republican, and was elected by 2,658 majority. It was the most exciting municipal election that had been held in St. Louis up to that time, and the result was a combination of all the anti-administration forces. Notwithstanding the complications of his first year's term of service, involving the management of the city's affairs in the midst of military occupation, Captain Taylor was re-elected in 1862. The next year Chauncey I. Filley, Republican, was elected mayor, but resigned before the expiration of his term and was succeeded by James S. Thomas, who occupied the executive chair for five years. Mr. Thomas, though elected mainly by Democrats, claimed to be independent of politics and his administration was a practical business one, closing in 1869. The Republicans carried the city with Nathan Cole as their leader for mayor at the election of 1869, but aside from the party designation the contest was without special significance. From 1871 to 1875 Captain Joseph Brown, Democrat, was at the head of the city government, and gave the people an eminently satisfactory administration. This was the period following the disfranchisement of so many voters by the test oath of loyalty. Captain Brown was suceeded by Arthur B. Barret, Democrat, who survived his inauguration, April 17, 1875, but a single week. A special election was held May 15, 1875, wherein Colonel James H. Britton, Democrat, was declared elected, but after a contest of several months was unseated by Henry Overstolz, his opponent in the race, who had run as an independent candidate. Mr. Overstolz was never a strong partisan. He possessed great personal popularity and, through his familiarity with municipal affairs, commanded general support. After he was nominated by the Democrats in the spring of 1877 to succeed himself as mayor, he was endorsed by the Republicans and, of course, triumphantly elected.

Meanwhile, the act of the Legislature providing for the separation of the western portion of the county from that part embracing the city of St. Louis, with extended limits, was ratified, and the term of elective municipal officers thereby fixed at four years, so that the administration of Mayor Overstolz lasted until 1881. His successor was William L. Ewing, Republican, who defeated Overstolz by a majority of 14,000. In the spring of 1885, following the election of Cleveland for President, David R. Francis, then but little known in politics, was nominated by the Democrats against Ewing, and was elected by over 1,500 majority, the vote being 20,861 for Francis and 19,349 for Ewing. The administration of Francis was an exceedingly able one, but among his appointive officers were two or more Republicans, including General John W. Turner, as street commissioner, under whose consummate management, especially in the matter of paving, the city made extraordinary progress. Mayor Francis, at the close of his term, stepped into the office of Governor, to which he was elected in November, 1888, and was succeeded in the mayoralty by Edward A. Noonan, Democrat, who defeated Nathan Frank, Republican. At the election of 1893 Cyrus P. Walbridge, Republican, was chosen mayor, defeating James Bannerman. In 1897 there were three candidates, namely, Henry Ziegenhein, Edwin Harrison and Lee Meriwether, the first a Republican and former comptroller of the city. The Democrats had a division at the nominating convention, resulting in two tickets. Ziegenhein won by a large majority.

It would be interesting, if the discussion could be compressed into the space available here, to review the detail work of the different administrations and trace through them the development of the municipal institutions as they exist to-day. But we are now treating of the partisan features, subordinated as they are in many cases to State, congressional and national issues, although general politics of later years have had only a nominal or ostensible relation to city elections. St. Louis, like all other municipalities, has, with its growth of population and the aggregation of class interests, experienced demoralizing influences in its local politics. The primary system has been subject here, as elsewhere, to debauchery of various sorts, not confined to any party; hence false registration, ballot-box stuffing, repeating and all the cheating tricks known to designing and unprincipled ward politicians. The city is not unique in having had its "bosses" and "heelers." Reform has time and again been the watchword of one organization and another, but the genius of man has not yet been capable of applying a remedy to these evils. The lust of office, the power of patronage, the measure of protection afforded doubtful schemes of plunder by being backed by the "push," and the comparative immunity secured by the tenure in office of willing or timid instruments, have, to an extent, driven the better classes from participation in nominating caucuses and conventions, thus leaving the weight of obligation on the part of elected officials for their elevation to the representatives of the modern methods referred to. Whilst, however, St. Louis has been by no means exempt in her municipal government from corrupt or dishonorable practices, it is believed that, as compared with other cities of the same class, her record is a good one. Her highest offices have generally been held by men of integrity, as well as of practical good sense, whilst her chief departments have been managed with conspicuous skill. As a rule the principal offices have been filled by citizens of high standing and excellent executive ability, whose services are remembered with gratitude and pride.

Politics of Congressional Elections.—From the organization of the State until 1833 Missouri had but one member of Congress, the population not entitling it to more. Previous to 1821 the territorial delegates were successively Edward Hempstead and Rufus Easton, of St. Louis, and John Scott, of Ste. Genevieve. At the first election, November, 1812, the contest for delegate was between Hempstead, Easton, Samuel Hammond and Matthew Lynn. Hempstead was the favorite. He had made a diligent study of the old records in regard to grants and titles, as a delegate in Congress was instrumental in having the Spanish concessions confirmed, was the author of an important pre-emption act for the benefit of the early settlers, and assisted in securing legislation whereby, through the reserving of common fields, a permanent school fund was established. He was not a candidate at the next election, at which Rufus Easton was elected by a small majority, the other candidates being Samuel Hammond,

Alexander McNair and Thomas F. Riddick. Two years later John Scott, of Ste. Genevieve, defeated Easton, who, however, contested the election. The case was referred back to the people and Scott won by an increased majority. He continued as a delegate until the admission of the State and was the first representative elected, holding the place for three terms. In the Twentieth, Twenty-first and Twenty-second Congresses, one term each, Edward Bates, Spencer Pettus and William H. Ashley, all of St. Louis, were the representatives. By this time Missouri had acquired an additional ratio and was entitled to two members. The State was not, however, apportioned into districts until 1846 and congressmen were elected on the general ticket. General Ashley was returned to the Twenty-third and Twenty-fourth Congresses, making three terms in all. His colleague in the Twenty-third was John Bull, of Howard County, and in the Twenty-fourth Albert G. Harrison, of Callaway. Harrison was re-elected to the Twenty-fifth Congress, and John Miller, who was Governor from 1825 to 1832, was elected to the Twenty-fifth, Twenty-sixth and Twenty-seventh Congresses, his colleague in the Twenty-sixth being John Jameson, of Callaway, and in the Twenty-seventh, John C. Edwards, the latter of whom was elected Governor in 1844. Missouri in the Twenty-eighth Congress—1843-5—was entitled to five representatives, who were James M. Hughes, Clay County; James H. Relfe, Washington; John Jameson, Callaway; Gustavus M. Brown, Monroe, and James B. Bowlin, St. Louis. Relfe and Bowlin were elected to the Twenty-ninth Congress, with John S. Phelps and Leonard H. Sims, of Greene, and Sterling Price, of Chariton, who resigned and was succeeded by William McDaniel, of Marion. The district system was adopted in 1846. To the Thirtieth and Thirty-first Congresses from the First (St. Louis) District, James B. Bowlin was elected and was succeeded by John F. Darby. In the Thirty-third —1853-5—Missouri was entitled to seven representatives, two of whom were elected at large—James J. Lindley, of Lewis, and Samuel Caruthers, Madison. It was in this Congress that Benton represented St. Louis. Phelps, who was first elected in 1844, served continuously for nine terms, or eighteen years. St. Louis was represented, under the apportionment of 1852, next to Benton by Luther M. Kennett, Francis P. Blair and J. R. Barret. To the Thirty-seventh Congress, Barret, who ran against Blair, received the certificate, but his seat was contested and Blair was admitted, but resigned and Barret was elected. Blair was, however, chosen for the "long term." Up to this period the most distinguished men elected to Congress, besides those already named, were James H. Green, afterward United States Senator; Willard P. Hall, afterward Provisional Lieutenant-Governor; W. V. N. Bay, afterward judge of the Supreme Court; Gilchrist Porter, Mordecai Oliver, Thomas P. Akers, T. L. Anderson, John B. Clark, James Craig, James S. Rollins, William A. Hall, E. H. Norton and Thomas L. Price.

From this time on, during his life, it is impossible for the historian to fail to observe the extraordinary personal stamp Francis P. Blair placed upon the political affairs of the State, as well as upon the city of St. Louis. He drew to him a following, not confined to any class, which displayed admiration, zeal and affection. He was looked up to as a leader, whose advice and counsel were accepted without halting by his enthusiastic partisans. His judgment was not seldom faulty, for he was impulsive and impetuous, but to them his reasoning was convincing. He possessed the heroic element, courage without bravado, and faced an audience of scoffers with a certain air of coolness and good humor that extorted respect at least. The congressional campaigns of the epoch immediately preceding the Civil War rang with the eloquence of a score of speakers whose names are interwoven with the history of the times. Music and pyrotechnics, parades of clubs with banners and mottoes, huzzas of the multitude and every known accompaniment of popular demonstration kept the community in a turmoil of excitement during these contests. Election days brought out in great numbers the voters to the polls, and at night the newspaper offices were surrounded by eager crowds awaiting the returns. In 1862 the Radical element had begun to dominate the Republican party. Blair was at the front as a general in the Union Army, but, though still an emancipationist, he counseled against extreme measures. His quarrel with Fremont had lost him the support of a large number of German Republicans, whilst his mistaken course in regard to the capture of Camp Jackson had separated him from many of the Conservative Unionists. A new apportionment gave to the State nine. in-

stead of seven, members of Congress, and a considerable portion of St. Louis was taken off and added to other counties. At the election of 1862, the congressional candidates in the First District were Samuel Knox, Radical; F. P. Blair, Liberal Republican, and Lewis Vital Bogy, Democrat, the vote being: Blair, 4,590; Knox, 4,743, and Bogy, 2,536. Henry T. Blow was elected in the Second District and was re-elected two years afterward. At the succeeding election John Hogan, Democrat, was successful in the First St. Louis District and was succeeded by General William A. Pile, Judge C. A. Newcomb being Pile's colleague from the Second. For the Forty-first Congress—1869-71—Erastus Wells defeated Hogan by one vote for the Democratic nomination, and was elected, General Pile being his Republican opponent. Wells was re-elected successively three times. His St. Louis colleague for two terms was G. A. Finkelnburg, Republican. A new apportionment gave Missouri thirteen representatives—two districts and a part of another to St. Louis—in the Forty-third and to and including the Forty-seventh Congress, and the numerical order was rearranged, with several changes also in the boundaries. In the Forty-third, ex-Lieutenant-Governor E. O. Stanard, Republican, represented the First District—having defeated William M. Grosvenor, Liberal—and William H. Stone, Democrat, the Third. Stone was re-elected, as was Wells, and the First District chose Edward C. Kehr, Democrat. In 1876 the Republicans carried all these districts and elected Anthony Ittner, Nathan Cole and Lyne S. Metcalfe. At the election of 1878 the Legislature having reformed the districts, the Democrats carried all the St. Louis districts, Erastus Wells and R. Graham Frost carrying the Second and Third, and Martin L. Clardy, of Farmington, the First, that district including, besides four wards of the city and Carondelet township, the counties of Madison, Jefferson, Washington, St. Francois and Ste. Genevieve. In 1880 Clardy defeated ex-Governor Fletcher, Republican, in this district. Thomas Allen was elected in the Second, defeating M. A. Rosenblatt, Republican, and Frost in the Third, against R. Sessinghaus, Republican. Mr. Allen died in April, 1882, a year after taking his seat, and Dr. J. H. McLean, Republican, was elected in the fall to fill the unexpired term. Another apportionment gave Missouri fourteen members. Clardy was re-elected in 1882, 1884 and 1886, from the new Tenth District, and John J. O'Neil, Democrat, from the Eighth. Colonel James O. Broadhead, Democrat, was elected in 1882 from the Ninth. In 1884-6 John M. Glover, Democrat, was elected from the Ninth. Two years later the Republicans carried all the St. Louis districts, electing F. G. Niedringhaus, Nathan Frank and William H. Kinsey from the Eighth, Ninth and Tenth, respectively. To the Fifty-second Congress, John J. O'Neil, Seth W. Cobb and Samuel Byrnes, of Potosi, all Democrats, were elected. Cobb was re-elected in 1892 and 1894; O'Neil in 1892, receiving the certificate also in 1894, but his seat in the Fifty-fourth Congress was successfully contested by Charles F. Joy. The State was again redistricted in 1892, under the census of 1890, and fifteen members elected. The Tenth District comprised the counties of St. Louis and Franklin, with a part of the city of St. Louis. In 1894, in this district, Richard Bartholdt, editor of the St. Louis "Tribune"—German daily, Republican—was elected, defeating Thomas J. Coppinger, Democrat, by a majority of nearly 8,000, and was re-elected in 1896, defeating Charles A. Lemp, Democrat. In this latter year Joy was elected by a majority of 3,777 over J. T. Hunt, Democrat, and Charles E. Pearce, Republican, by a majority of 3,915 over R. H. Kern, Democrat.

Many Missouri members of Congress besides those included in the St. Louis list have distinguished themselves in the politics of the State. James S. Rollins was a member of the Thirty-seventh Congress. Governor McClurg was a member from 1863 to 1869. Benjamin F. Loan, defeated for Senator by Schurz, served in the Thirty-ninth and Fortieth. John F. Benjamin, of Shelby, was a member from 1865 to 1871. A conspicuous figure was Robert T. Van Horn in the Thirty-ninth, Fortieth and Forty-first Congresses. D. P. Dyer, with the help of Secretary of State Rodman, served from 1869 to 1871. Richard P. Bland, the noted silver advocate, made his first appearance as a representative in 1873 and was without a break in his membership until 1895. He was, however, again elected in 1896. Judge A. H. Buckner served from 1873 to 1885. United States District Judge John F. Philips was in the Forty-fourth and Forty-sixth Congresses. John B. Clark, Jr., son of General John B. Clark, represented the How-

ard District from 1873 to 1883, and was afterward clerk of the House. William H. Hatch served from the Hannibal District from 1879 to 1894. Nicholas Ford, who was beaten for Governor by General Marmaduke, was a member from 1879 to 1883. Alexander M. Dockery, formerly a newspaper editor and banker, of Gallatin, first entered Congress in 1883, and has served continuously to the time of making up this record. James N. Burnes, prominent in Northwest Missouri, was a member of the Forty-ninth and Fiftieth Congresses. His son, D. D., afterward was elected in the same district. William Warner, a distinguished Republican, served from 1885 to 1889. John T. Heard represented the Sedalia District from 1885 to 1893. William J. Stone was a member three terms before he was elected Governor. Other members of note were John Cosgrove, Charles H. Morgan, R. W. Fyan, D. A. DeArmond, Marshall Arnold, John C. Tarsney, John B. Hale, Lowndes H. Davis, James R. Waddill, S. L. Sawyer, etc.

Politics of Senatorial Elections.—The convention which framed the organic law of the State met at a hotel at the corner of Third and Vine Streets, in St. Louis, June, 1820. Among its forty members were David Barton, Edward Bates, Pierre Chouteau, Jr., Alexander McNair, Duff Green, Thomas Riddick, John Scott and Benjamin Reeves, the foremost men of the Territory. The first session of the Legislature convened at St. Louis, September, 1820, at which David Barton and Thomas H. Benton were elected United States Senators in anticipation of the admission of the State. Barton was a native of Tennessee, fought in the War of 1812, served as a circuit judge in 1816, and was president of the convention that made the new constitution. The career of Benton was longer and more conspicuous, but in no respect was he the superior of Barton, who, when he was elected, was the most popular man inside of Missouri's borders, being a captivating orator and possessed of genius of an exalted type. His failure of election in 1830 is attributable to his adherence to John Quincy Adams, the sentiment of the State being overwhelmingly with Jackson. He was defeated for Congress by Spencer Pettus in 1831, but afterward served a term in the State Senate. Near the close of his life, 1837, Judge Barton was afflicted with a mental disease. At the senatorial election in 1830, Barton did not suffer his name to be used in the balloting. The candidates were Alexander Buckner, who received fifty-four votes; John Miller, twenty-seven, and William H. Ashley, two. Buckner died in 1833, and Dr. Lewis F. Linn was appointed by Governor Dunklin to fill the vacancy. Dr. Linn was a Kentuckian, born in 1796, and settled in Ste. Genevieve, in 1815. The Legislature elected him and he served in the Senate until his death, October, 1843. He was the author of the act by which the Platte country was acquired, and participated notably in the discussion of the Oregon question. Among those taking a pominent part in the Platte purchase was David R. Atchison, and it was he who succeeded Dr. Linn. Atchison became president pro tem. of the Senate and he was one of the members of that body when the Jackson resolutions, aimed at Benton, were passed by the Missouri Legislature. It was no task for Atchison to obey the resolutions at which Benton revolted. For two years the Legislature could elect no successor to Atchison, and consequently Missouri was with but one Senator, but the result was accomplished in 1857 by the election of James S. Green, of Canton, one of the strongest men intellectually in the State, the vote resulting: Green, 89; Benton, 33; Kennett, 32; scattering, 8. Mr. Green became chairman of the committee on Territories, deposing Stephen A. Douglas, and, in the discussions with Douglas, won unusual honors as a debater. He was also very effective on the stump. In the canvass of 1860 he supported Breckinridge, bringing on himself the ire of the Douglas men, by whose efforts he lost his seat in the Senate, the prize falling to Waldo P. Johnson, of St. Clair County. Although Johnson was elected as a Union man, he resigned his seat when the Civil War began and joined the Confederate Army, while Green stayed at home and fell into habits of dissipation. Senator Johnson was president of the Constitutional Convention of 1875. His colleague at the time of his resignation was Governor Polk, who also resigned; but the Senate early in 1862, expelled them both, notwithstanding. Provisional Lieutenant-Governor Hall, in the absence of Governor Gamble, appointed Robert Wilson, of Platte County, who had succeeded General Sterling Price as president of the State Convention of 1861-2, to fill Johnson's seat, and John B. Henderson, of Pike, to fill Polk's until the Legislature should

elect. Wilson had been an old-line Whig and Henderson a Douglas Democrat. The latter had already become an ardent supporter of the war and taken the field. The Legislature, in January, 1863, elected Henderson to serve the remainder of Polk's term. Thirty ballots were taken from day to day for the other senatorship, but, without choosing, the Legislature adjourned till November, and on the 13th B. Gratz Brown was elected by a vote of 74 to 64 for James O. Broadhead. General Henderson was then elected for the term ending March 4, 1869, receiving 84 votes to 42 for John S. Phelps. Brown and Henderson were the first Republicans representing Missouri in the United States Senate. Henderson was succeeded by Carl Schurz, and Schurz, in 1875, by Francis M. Cockrell, of Johnson County, who has served continuously since. Cockrell was a brigadier-general in the Confederate Army, but had never held a civil office. In 1874 he was beaten by Charles H. Hardin for the Democratic nomination for Governor, by a fraction of one vote. He is a native Missourian, and the second one—Colonel Bogy being the other—who has ever been a member of the United States Senate. Charles D. Drake was elected in Brown's place, the latter's term expiring in 1867, but President Grant appointing him to the Court of Claims, he resigned in 1870, and Governor McClurg appointed D. T. Jewett, who, however, served only till March, 1871, the Legislature electing General F. P. Blair. At the election two years later, the candidates besides Blair were John S. Phelps and Lewis V. Bogy. The health of General Blair was such that it was feared that he could not survive many months. With difficulty he proceeded to Jefferson City, and by a supreme effort entered the hall where the caucus was held. Governor Phelps was likewise very feeble. General George P. Dorris, a man of wealth, but of no great political standing, had announced himself a candidate and the gossips had it that he was merely a cat's-paw for the furtherance of the schemes of the friends of Bogy. Bogy was elected, and a charge of bribery was investigated upon his demand, but there was no proof obtainable and he was exonerated. Upon his death, Governor Phelps appointed David H. Armstrong, then police commissioner of St. Louis, to the vacancy, announcing himself a candidate for the regular term, but the Legislature refused to continue Armstrong even for the few months intervening, and elected General James Shields, of Carrollton, the Mexican hero who had already served terms as United States Senator from Illinois and Minnesota. At the same time the Legislature elected George G. Vest, of Sedalia, for the long term, his opponents in the Democratic caucus being Governor Phelps and Samuel T. Glover. Mr. Vest had been a member of the Legislature before the war and served in the Confederate Senate at Richmond. His reputation at home as a lawyer and orator has been maintained in the upper branch of Congress. He was re-elected in 1885, 1891 and 1897. To recapitulate: The Barton line of succession is Buckner, Linn, Atchison, Green, Johnson, Wilson, Brown, Drake, Jewett, Blair, Bogy, Armstrong, Shields, and Vest. Benton, Geyer, Polk, Henderson, Schurz and Cockrell served in the order named. Since the days of Andrew Jackson all of the twenty-one Missouri Senators have been Democrats, excepting those elected or appointed between the years 1862 and 1869.

Politics of State Elections.—As has been remarked in the general review of political parties, partisanship in Missouri up to 1833 was chiefly of a personal nature. The course of Andrew Jackson in the presidential chair with regard to nullification and the United States Bank was the tocsin of organization on real political issues. Missouri uniformly supported the Jackson, or Democratic, ticket in 1824-8-32, voting for Van Buren in 1836 against Harrison, and again for Van Buren against Harrison in 1840. In the latter year the State cast 29,760 votes for Van Buren against 22,792 for Harrison. At every presidential election the electoral vote of Missouri had been given to the Democratic candidate down to 1864, when McClellan was beaten by Lincoln—the vote, then restricted by disfranchisement, being: Lincoln, 71,676; McClellan, 31,626.

At the first State election, 1826, Alexander McNair and William Clark, both of St. Louis, were the candidates for Governor. Clark had been Governor of the Territory since 1812. McNair was born in Pennsylvania, in 1774, came to the "future great city" thirty years afterward, and in the War of 1812 was in the United States service as colonel of the Missouri militia. The total vote of the State for Governor was 9,132, McNair receiving a ma-

jority of 4,020. At the same time, William H. Ashley, of St. Louis, was elected Lieutenant-Governor. McNair died in this city in 1826. The Legislature was composed of fourteen senators and forty-three representatives. The judges of the Supreme Court, three in number, were at that time and down to the year 1851 appointed by the Governor, the first members being Matthias McGirk, of Montgomery County; John Rice Jones, of Pike, and John D. Cook, of Cape Girardeau. McGirk and Cook had been delegates to the Constitutional Convention; Judge Cook had been president of the Territorial Legislative Council. At the second State election, the candidates for Governor were Frederick Bates and William H. Ashley, both residents of St. Louis. Bates, who came to St. Louis from Virginia in 1806, had been a member of the Constitutional Convention, and had previously served in important capacities under the territorial government. Ashley had been a heroic Indian fighter and by his adventurous spirit cut his way into the wilds of the Rocky Mountain region and discovered the Great Southern Pass, but the romance of his life was not sufficient to overcome the general recognition of Bates' superior qualifications for the office. Governor Bates, however, was taken sick of pleurisy and died suddenly in August, 1825. Benjamin Reeves, who was elected Lieutenant-Governor, would have succeeded to the executive chair, but two weeks before the death of Governor Bates he resigned. The president pro tem. of the State Senate at the time was Abraham J. Williams, of Columbia, and the duties of the office devolved upon him. A special election was held December 8, 1825, at which John Miller, of Howard County, William G. Carr, of St. Louis, and David Todd, were candidates. Miller received 2,300 votes; Carr, 1,470, and Todd, 1,113, out of a total State population of 62,000. In 1821 Miller was re-elected without opposition. Governor Miller, a native of Virginia, moved to Ohio about the year 1800 and was colonel of the State militia in the service of the United States in the War of 1812, in which he won distinction. He remained in the United States Army after the war and was ordered to Missouri. Resigning in 1817 he was appointed Register of Lands, which office he held when he was elected Governor in 1825. In 1832 there were three candidates for Governor: Daniel Dunklin, of Washington County, Democrat; Dr. John Bull, of Howard, Adams ... Whig; and Samuel C. Davis, Independent. Dunklin had been Lieutenant-Governor during Governor Miller's last term. Dunklin had 9,121 votes; Bull, 8,035; Davis, 386. At the same time, Lilburn W. Boggs was elected Lieutenant-Governor. The United States census of 1830 showed the population of the State to be 140,455, including 25,091 slaves, and 569 free colored. Governor Dunklin resigned September 30, 1836, to take the office of United States Surveyor-General, and for the remainder of his term the duties devolved upon Lieutenant-Governor Boggs. At the quadrennial election, held the preceding month, Boggs was the successful Democratic candidate for Governor, his Whig opponent being William H. Ashley, who had been a member of Congress since 1831. At this period politics ran very high between the Whigs and Jackson men, but after a most exciting canvass, Boggs was elected, 27,872 votes being cast, an increase of 60 per cent over the previous gubernatorial election, of which Boggs received 14,815, and Ashley 13,057. The administration of Governor Boggs was signalized by his vigorous war for the extermination of the Mormons, and for which, soon after his retirement, he nearly lost his life by cowardly assassination at the hands of a hireling. He was shot three times in the head and neck, at his home, in Independence, but nevertheless, recovered. The financial panic of 1837 caused great commotion in Missouri, as in all parts of the United States. The central branch of the United States Bank was located in St. Louis, with another branch at Fayette, and afterward branches at some other points. The Whig party made the most of the failure of the national bank system, and when the presidential election of 1840 came on, were aggressively warring on Andrew Jackson's policy. It was at this election that the Whigs of Missouri became a solid organization, although at the legislative election in 1838 they had returned thirty members to the Democrats' twenty. The memorable presidential campaign of 1840, the "log cabin and hard cider campaign," with Van Buren as the Democratic, and Harrison the Whig candidate, was closely contested in Missouri, and the strongest nominations on each side were made for State offices. The Democrats selected Thomas Reynolds, of Howard County, for Governor, the Whigs opposing him with John B. Clark, also of How-

ard. Judge Reynolds was a native of Kentucky, whence he emigrated to Illinois, where he became judge of the Supreme Court. In 1828 he came to Missouri. In 1842-3 he was a member of the State Legislature, and was conspicuous as the author of an act abolishing imprisonment for debt. Clark was a self-educated man, of rather rough exterior, but possessed of strong intellectual faculties and qualities fitting him for leadership. Many years afterward he served in Congress, was a general in the Confederate army, and a Senator. The Democrats carried the State—Reynolds, 29,625; Clark, 22,212—and Reynolds became Governor. February 9, 1844, having been in ill-health for several months, he locked himself in a room and killed himself with a pistol. Meredith M. Marmaduke succeeded him as Governor, and filled out the remaining part of the executive term, which expired November 20th of the same year.

At the ninth quadrennial State election the candidates for Governor were John C. Edwards, Democrat, and Charles H. Allen, who ran as an independent, but received almost the entire vote of the Whigs. The result of the election was: Edwards, 36,978; Allen, 31,357. Edwards was a Kentuckian by birth, but was raised and educated in Tennessee, coming to Missouri in 1828. Two years later, Governor Miller appointed him Secretary of State, which office he held during Miller's term of seven years. He was elected to Congress in 1840. Soon after Edwards' four years were out, he emigrated to California, where he died in 1888. In 1845 a convention was held to frame a new Constitution, which instrument was submitted, and sixty-six delegates were chosen by the people of the State; but the new Constitution was voted down by a majority of 9,000. The main ground of opposition, which came chiefly from St. Louis, was that it provided for the election of supreme judges by popular vote, instead of their being appointed by the Governor. But the succeeding legislative session submitted an amendment to the existing Constitution, covering this very point, and it was ratified, so that the supreme judges have been elective since 1851. At the election for members of the convention, held August, 1845, six delegates were elected in St Louis on a Native American ticket, defeating six Democrats.

The gubernatorial race of 1848 was run by Austin A. King, Democrat, and James S. Rollins, Whig, resulting in the election of the former, the vote being: King, 48,921; Rollins, 33,968. Thomas L. Price was elected Lieutenant-Governor. The period of King's administration was a stirring one in politics. A bombshell thrown into the Legislature by Claib. F. Jackson, Senator from Howard, in January, 1849, denying the right of Congress to legislate on the subject of slavery, produced consternation in all quarters. The Benton faction of the Democratic party was aroused to energetic action. Benton appealed to the people and made a canvass of the State, full of defiance, denunciation of his opponents, and self-laudation. He staked everything on the game and lost. The Legislature that met in 1851, on the fortieth ballot, elected Henry S. Geyer, of St. Louis, that vote being: Geyer, 80; Benton, 55; B. F. Stringfellow, 18, with four scattering.

The following year, at the election for Governor, the vote stood: Sterling Price, Democrat, 46,245; James Winston, Whig, 32,748. Price was one of the strongest anti-Benton leaders in Missouri, and his election by so large a majority emphasized the verdict of the Legislature in retiring Colonel Benton. But, although Benton was personally defeated for Senator, his cause did not lack for champions. He himself was elected to the lower house of Congress in 1852. At this time, through the influence of the Benton excitement, the State Legislature was a political storm center. The session that began in December, 1852, embraced many of the brightest minds of the State. Robert M. Stewart, C. F. Jackson and B. Gratz Brown, each of whom was afterward Governor; Thomas L. Price, Lieutenant-Governor; Thomas Allen, afterward president of the Iron Mountain railroad, and member of Congress; Frank P. Blair, afterward member of Congress, general in the army and candidate for vice-president; Judge Arnold Krekel, Richard A. Barret, General John D. Stevenson, Bart Able, and many others, who have been prominent in public affairs, were marshalled on the Whig, Benton, or anti-Benton sides. From this period on to the opening of the Civil War, in 1861, the politics of the State, conjoined with congressional and senatorial elections, bore the impress of the greatest intellects within Missouri's borders, and developed managerial skill and sagacity not surpassed anywhere in the Union. Few elections anywhere have been more exciting than

the national, State and congressional elections of 1856 in Missouri, and particularly in St. Louis, then a city of 150,000 people. The slavery agitation growing out of the repeal of the Missouri compromise; the Kansas border troubles; the transition of the Whig party, and rise of the "Know-Nothings," or American party; the organization of the Republican party, headed by John C. Fremont; the opening of the popular sovereignty issue by Douglas, and, locally, the "fight of his life," by Colonel Benton—all gave an intensity to politics that may have been equaled, but was not exceeded, by the stirring events of 1860, which, with the Civil War that followed, were the culmination of long years of strife. In this year of 1856 Colonel Benton, prompted by inordinate vanity, essayed the Herculean task of beating down the opposition his course had provoked by becoming an independent candidate for Governor, hoping through success to pave the way to regain his seat in the Senate. The Democratic nominee was Trusten Polk, whilst Robert C. Ewing was put forward as the "Know-Nothing" champion. Benton still avowed himself a Democrat and supported Buchanan for President, although his son-in-law, Fremont, more nearly represented his political views. Great crowds attended the meetings throughout the State, and had these been a true criterion of the purpose of the people, the chances of triumph would have seemed to be with Benton. His canvass was a wonder in the vitality and endurance shown, and enlisted admiration from foe as well as friend. But the surface indications were illusive. Colonel Benton was distanced in the race, and came out third, the vote standing: Polk, 46,993; Ewing, 40,589; Benton, 27,618. At the same election the regular Democrats carried the Legislature and Governor Polk was chosen United States Senator to take the place of Henry S. Geyer, he—Polk—serving till January 10, 1862, when he was expelled on charges of disloyalty. The resignation of Governor Polk necessitated a new election, which was held in August, 1857, and at which Robert M. Stewart ran as the Democratic candidate. Opposed to him was James S. Rollins, supported by the old-line Whigs, "Know-Nothings" and emancipationists. This was another hot campaign, memorable in the annals of Missouri politics. Stewart was one of the brightest intellects ever connected with public affairs in the State; though unfortunately, erratic in some of his personal traits. Rollins was an orator, graceful in speech and persuasive in his eloquence. In manners he was courtly and as a politician "smooth." The contest was the closest ever known in Missouri, and for some time the result was doubtful. As officially footed up the vote was: Stewart, 47,975; Rollins, 47,641. Under Stewart's administration railroad improvement received encouragement, the Governor losing no occasion to recommend State aid.

The resolutions on which Claiborne F. Jackson was nominated for Governor early in 1860 surprised the people by repudiating the idea of loaning State bonds for railroad development. For this the "Missouri Republican," which had become the organ of the Democracy, "kicked over the platform," and succeeded in getting a satisfactory expression from Jackson as to what his course would be. The convention was held early in the spring, so as, with the nomination of the Democratic ticket, to send delegates to the Charleston Convention. The action of this latter body was awaited with much concern by Jackson, who hoped for a harmonious result. When the news came from Baltimore of the split and the placing of two Democratic presidential tickets in the field, the effect on the State canvass was considered with alarm. The adherents of Breckinridge in St. Louis called loudly upon Jackson to espouse at once the cause of the Kentuckian, whilst day after day the "Missouri Republican" thundered in his ears that a failure to support Douglas as the regular nominee would absolve every Douglas man in the State from the duty of supporting the Claib. Jackson ticket. Finally, after considerable dubitation and delay, Jackson, ostensibly as the result of a conference with General John B. Clark, at Fayette, openly advised his party to support Douglas. This announcement fell like a bomb in the ranks of the St. Louis secession coterie, and their coadjutors outside. It resulted in rallying the latter to the standard of Hancock Jackson for Governor, who had been placed in the field contingently and as a menace. Meanwhile, Sample Orr, "the unknown," had saddled his horse somewhere in the Southwest, and was beginning to wake the echoes as an independent candidate, representing the Bell and Everett party. The Republicans nominated James B Gardenhire. Nothing could better illustrate the conservative character of the people than